

**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 www.fortisbc.com

September 28, 2021

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. 1599232 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to the Commercial Energy Consumers A

Response to the Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

On July 30, 2021, FEI filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with the regulatory timetable established in British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-277-21 for the review of the Application, FEI respectfully submits the attached response to CEC IR No. 1.

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



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 1. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 8

#### 2.2 INFLATION FACTOR CALCULATION SUMMARY

In the MRP Decision, the BCUC approved an Inflation Factor (I-Factor) using the actual CPI-BC and BC-AWE indices from the previous year and the actual labour weighting based on the most recent completed year of actuals. FEI uses inflation data from July through June and Statistics Canada Table 18-10-0004-01 for CPI-BC and Table 14-10-0223-01 to determine AWE-BC. The supporting Statistics Canada tables are provided in Appendix A1. The latest available month of April 2021 for AWE-BC and May 2021 for CPI-BC has been used as a placeholder, as results to June 2021 have not been released by Statistics Canada. Once results for these periods are available, this placeholder will be replaced with actuals and included in an Evidentiary Update or Compliance Filing.

- 3 1.1 Is it typical that Statistics Canada has not released the relevant data at the time
  4 that FEI produces its Annual Review?
- 5

2

- .
- 6 7

8

- 1.1.1 If no, please explain why it is delayed this year.
- 1.1.2 If yes, has FEI typically used the latest available month as a placeholder for the information? Please explain.

## 9 Response:

10 It is typical that Statistics Canada has not released all of the relevant CPI-BC and AWE-BC data

11 at the time FEI produces its Annual Review materials. There is an approximately one month (CPI)

12 and two month (AWE) delay in the publishing of the relevant data for a given period.

FEI typically uses the latest available month of CPI and AWE data as a placeholder when the relevant data is not available. FEI replaces the placeholder data with the actual data once it becomes available in an Evidentiary Update or the Compliance Filing.



 FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)
 Submission Date:

 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)
 September 28, 2021

 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)
 Page 2

#### 1 2. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 9

		Table: 18-10-	Table: 14-10-					Last Co	mplated		
		0004-01	0222-01	12 Meb	Autorago			Last Col	npieteu		
		0004-01	0225-01	12 14111	Average			Non	di		
Line		BC CPI	BC AWE	CPI	AWE	CPI	AWE	Labour	Labour	L-Factor	MRP Year
No	Date	index	Ś	index	Ś	%	%	%	%	%	Minr Tear
1	Jul-2019	132.4	995.70	index.	*	~	~				
2	Aug-2019	132.2	1.003.20								
3	Sep-2019	132.0	1,007.69								
4	Oct-2019	132.2	1.015.61								
5	Nov-2019	131.8	1.012.26								
6	Dec-2019	131.7	1,014.87								
7	Jan-2020	132.1	1,025.98								
8	Feb-2020	132.9	1,024.80								
9	Mar-2020	132.3	1,029.14								
10	Apr-2020	131.2	1,105.84								
11	May-2020	131.5	1,127.73								
12	Jun-2020	132.6	1,097.00	132.1	1,038.32						
13	Jul-2020	132.6	1,095.17								
14	Aug-2020	132.4	1,089.30								
15	Sep-2020	132.5	1,092.97								
16	Oct-2020	132.9	1,093.25								
17	Nov-2020	133.3	1,098.85								
18	Dec-2020	132.8	1,109.54								
19	Jan-2021	133.6	1,115.13								
20	Feb-2021	134.1	1,114.34								
21	Mar-2021	134.9	1,104.90								
22	Apr-2021	135.2	1,110.80								
23	May-2021	135.1	1,110.80								
24	Jun-2021	135.1	1,110.80	133.7	1,103.82	1.237%	6.309%	49%	51%	3.824%	2022

#### Table 2-1: I-Factor Calculation

2

2.1 Please provide the average BC CPI and AWE figures for 2017 and 2018.

3 4

#### 5 **Response:**

6 A table including the average BC CPI and AWE figures for 2017 and 2018 is provided below.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 3

		Table: 18-10-	Table: 11-				
		0004-01	10-0223-				
			01				
			01	<u>12 Mth</u>	Average		
Line		BC CPI	BC AWE	CPI	AWE	CPI	AWE
No.	Date	index	\$	index	\$	%	%
1	Jan-2016	120.7	907.68				
2	Feb-2016	120.8	916.60				
3	Mar-2016	121.8	915.73				
4	Apr-2016	121.8	923.40				
5	May-2016	122.7	919.18				
6	Jun-2016	123.1	927.40				
7	Jul-2016	123.3	917.43				
8	Aug-2016	123.4	922.16				
9	Sep-2016	123.2	918.98				
10	Oct-2016	123.1	917.79				
11	Nov-2016	122.7	927.52				
12	Dec-2016	122.7	931.20	122.4	920.42		
13	Jan-2017	123.5	933.49				
14	Feb-2017	123.6	933.34				
15	Mar-2017	124.2	933.44				
16	Apr-2017	124.4	941.14				
17	May-2017	125.0	942.96				
18	Jun-2017	125.2	945.30				
19	Jul-2017	125.6	939.82				
20	Aug-2017	125.9	939.63				
21	Sep-2017	125.7	951.62				
22	Oct-2017	125.6	950.15				
23	Nov-2017	125.9	952.55				
24	Dec-2017	125.2	958.36	125.0	943.48	2.076%	2.505%
25	Jan-2018	126.1	958.18				
26	Feb-2018	127.0	962.49				
27	Mar-2018	127.4	963.50				
28	Apr-2018	127.7	953.96				
29	May-2018	128.4	958.99				
30	Jun-2018	128.6	967.72				
31	Jul-2018	129.7	973.83				
32	Aug-2018	129.6	979.56				
33	Sep-2018	128.9	975.55				
34	Oct-2018	129.4	978.26				
35	Nov-2018	128.9	979.83				
36	Dec-2018	129.0	977.17	128.4	969.09	2.727%	2.714%

Does FEI consider that the 6.9% wage increase indicated using the AWE as

required in the calculation of Inflation for the MRP accurately reflects wage

increases that it has or will be required to pay? Please explain why or why not.

2

1

2.2



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 4

### 1 Response:

2 FEI notes that the average AWE increase in Table 2-1 of the Application is 6.309 percent, not 6.9

3 percent as stated in the question.

While FEI acknowledges that the current AWE trend may not be reflective of the wage increases specifically being experienced by FEI, FEI expects that over time the higher AWE trend will reverse as the labour impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic lessen and that the near term

7 increases observed in the AWE will be offset in subsequent years.

8 As shown in the summary below of 2016 to 2022 CPI and AWE data, both CPI and AWE can

9 fluctuate on a yearly basis. These yearly changes may be different than what FEI actually

10 experiences in a given year. For AWE, excluding 2021 and 2022 where FEI expects the impact

11 to lessen in future years, the AWE cumulative average yearly increases from 2016 to 2020 (i.e.,

12 about 2 percent average) are generally consistent with a 2 percent average wage increase.

Description	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Average
CPI	0.980%	1.627%	1.979%	2.345%	2.692%	1.596%	1.237%	1.779%
AWE	2.050%	1.250%	1.473%	2.646%	2.881%	5.745%	6.309%	3.193%

14 The 2022 BC-AWE used in the Application is based on the latest data from Statistics Canada and

15 remains a valid and objective measure of the economy-wide labour inflation in BC. FEI believes

16 that there is no evidentiary basis on which to deviate from the approved method for calculating

17 the inflation factor for 2022.

Further, the I-Factor used for determining FEI's index-based O&M funding consists of both the AWE for labour and the CPI for non-labour. While the AWE may seem high, the CPI used for the 2022 formula O&M may be low and not necessarily reflecting the inflationary pressures FEI faces in 2022 for its non-labour expenditures. A recent news release from Statistics Canada (reproduced below) reports the August 2021 CPI at about 4 percent, indicative of potential inflationary increases in the near term and possibly into 2022<sup>1</sup>. In contrast, the proposed CPI for 2022 in the Application is 1.237 percent.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Link to Statistics Canada news release - <u>https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/210915/dq210915a-eng.htm?HPA=1&indid=3665-1&indgeo=0</u>.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 5

# **Consumer Price Index, August 2021**

Released at 8:30 a.m. Eastern time in The Daily, Wednesday, September 15, 2021

The Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 4.1% on a year-over-year basis in August, the fastest pace since March 2003, up from a 3.7% gain in July. The increase in prices mainly stems from an accumulation of recent price pressures and from lower price levels in 2020. Excluding gasoline, the CPI rose 3.2% year over year.

The monthly CPI rose 0.2% in August, down from a 0.6% increase in July. On a seasonally adjusted monthly basis, the CPI rose 0.4%.

#### Chart 1



1

2 Therefore, FEI considers that an adjustment to the AWE is not warranted and would not be 3 appropriate. The AWE is only one component of the overall MRP, and FEI considers it 4 unreasonable to make adjustments to one specific component of the MRP without consideration 5 of the other components. The determination of the calculation of the Net Inflation Factor was 6 based on the evidence at the time of the MRP proceeding. Depending on the actual 7 circumstances in each year of the MRP, it is expected that FEI's actual operating results may not 8 completely align with each element of the approved MRP. For example, please refer to the 9 response to BCUC IR1 3.3.2 regarding growth capital.

If earnings under the MRP are either unreasonably high or unreasonably low, there is an approved off-ramp<sup>2</sup> which would trigger a full review of the MRP. As noted in the response to BCUC IR1
1.3, FEI's actual ROE in the first year of the MRP was very close to its approved ROE. As such, the off-ramp is not triggered.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> MRP Decision, p. 101.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### Page 6

#### 1 3. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, pages 12 and 14

#### 3.2 **OVERVIEW OF FORECAST METHODS**

FEI's demand forecast methods are consistent with prior years and the recommendations in the FEI Forecasting Method Study filed as Appendix B2 in FortisBC's 2020-2024 MRP Application. The Forecasting Method Study represented the culmination of a number of years of research and testing of alternative forecasting methods in response to the forecasting directives in Order G-86-15 and accompanying decision related to the FEI Annual Review for 2015 Rates Application. As a result of this study, FEI adopted the Exponential Smoothing method (ETS) for the purpose of forecasting residential and commercial use rates, as ETS proved to be the most accurate method for this purpose. See Appendix A3 for a detailed description of FEI's demand forecast methods.

The demand forecast relies on three components:

- the residential and commercial net customer additions forecast;9
- the residential and commercial use per customer (UPC) forecast; and
- the Industrial Forecast.





Does FEI undertake any ongoing assessment of its Demand forecasting to identify 3.1 any areas of weakness or potential areas of improvement? Please explain why or why not.

> 3.1.1 If yes, please explain what activities FEI undertakes, and on which components (i.e. UPC for residential or commercial, aspects of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8



3

2

Industrial Survey, etc.) to ensure forecasting is conducted as accurately as possible.

#### 4 **Response:**

5 As explained in Section 3.2 (page 12) of the Application, FEI recently completed the Forecasting 6 Method Study, which was filed as Appendix B2 in FortisBC's 2020-2024 MRP Application. The 7 Forecasting Method Study represented the culmination of a number of years of research and 8 testing of alternative forecasting methods in response to the forecasting directives in Order G-86-9 15 and accompanying Decision related to the FEI Annual Review for 2015 Delivery Rates Application. As a result of this study, FEI adopted the Exponential Smoothing method (ETS) for 10 11 the purpose of forecasting residential and commercial use rates, as ETS proved to be the most 12 accurate method for this purpose.

13 Any potential new forecasting methods need to be studied carefully, over a period of time, so that

14 changes do not increase forecast variances. If methods are frequently changed, then forecasts

15 and trends become difficult to compare over time and forecast variances can increase.

16 The following timeline shows the work done to complete the Forecasting Method Study and

17 demonstrates the time and effort required to successfully change methods. This time and effort

18 must be taken into consideration before undertaking future method studies, particularly given

FEI's low forecast variances. 19



20

21 As part of the study and research data, FEI established a mean absolute percent error (MAPE) 22 benchmark for the demand forecast of 4 percent over a seven-year period. FEI's historical 23 aggregate demand variances (shown in the table below) have consistently been below the 4 24 percent benchmark. The current seven-year aggregate demand variance is 3.2 percent as shown

25 in the table below. FEI also notes that the recent three-year variance is just 1.4 percent.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 8

Demand,PJs	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	7Yr. MAPE
FEI								
Forecast	216.7	205.2	205.7	212.8	226.2	232.6	232.0	
Actual	205.8	209.5	219.3	223.3	225.8	226.4	229.0	
Error = (ACT-FCST)	(10.9)	4.3	13.6	10.5	(0.4)	(6.2)	(2.9)	
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	-5.3%	2.1%	6.2%	4.7%	-0.2%	-2.7%	-1.3%	
Abs. Percent Error	5.3%	2.1%	6.2%	4.7%	0.2%	2.7%	1.3%	3.2%

1

- 2 FEI also provides the following chart which shows the aggregate demand variance plotted against
- 3 the 4 percent benchmark for the period from 2011 to 2020. In six of the ten years, including the
- 4 last three, the aggregate demand variance has been less than 4 percent.



5





Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 4. Reference: Exhibit B-2. Page 14-15

#### 3.3.1 Residential

#### 3.3.1.1 Residential Customer Additions

Consistent with past practice, FEI uses the Conference Board of Canada (CBOC) housing starts forecast as a proxy for residential net customer additions. The CBOC data used for the forecast, provided in Appendix A1, was issued in April 2021. The 2022 forecast of 10,096 additions reflects the actual residential additions recorded in 2020 and the single family and multi-family growth rate forecasts from the CBOC forecast.

As shown in Figure 3-2, residential customer additions are forecast to decrease by 688 additions in 2022F compared to 2021S. Figure 3-2 provides the residential net customer additions for 2011 through 2022.

FEI notes that there was a residential customer additions dip in early 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic; however, once the builder/developer community adjusted its operations for the pandemic, building activities accelerated to meet the new demand. This resulted in very robust growth in the second and third quarter of 2020 and contributed to the increased customer additions. In addition, with more customers working from home, it is likely that fewer customers chose to disconnect in 2020, which had the effect of contributing to the increase of net customer additions relative to forecast.



Figure 3-2: Residential Net Customer Additions

4 5 6

7

8

4.1 Please confirm that FEI does not modify or massage the residential customer net additions figure input by its own expectations, but relies only on the Conference Board of Canada housing starts information.





#### 1 Response:

2 Confirmed. FEI does not modify actual residential customer net additions data prior to using it to 3 develop future forecasts.

4 The forecast of residential customer net additions is the product of the prior year's residential net 5 customer additions and the Conference Board of Canada (CBOC) housing starts growth rates. 6 FEI does not rely solely on the CBOC housing starts information, but applies the CBOC growth 7 rates to FEI's net customer additions data.

- 8 9
- 11 4.2 What activities does FEI undertake to understand the reasons behind the dips and 12 increases it sees in its residential customer additions?
- 13

10

#### 14 Response:

15 Net customer additions as shown in the graph above are a result of new (gross) customer 16 additions from a new service line and meter being installed to serve a new customer, move 17 in/move out activity in existing service, and disconnects. The largest fluctuations in net customer 18 numbers are driven by move in and move out activity. This is followed by new customer additions 19 and disconnects.

20 Some of the fluctuations in net customers are timing differences between move in/move out 21 activity. Some disconnects return as a new attachment at a later date. Some disconnects leave 22 the system and, when a new building is constructed, they choose an energy source that is not 23 gas. Lastly, there is fluctuation in gross attachments driven by new construction activity as well 24 as conversion options.

25 FEI's activities to better understand the dips and increases in residential customer additions are 26 primarily focused on understanding changes and trends in new construction through FEI's sales 27 staff working with builders, developers and HVAC contractors. From working directly with these 28 stakeholders, FEI understands that recently there was a slowdown in new construction activity in 29 spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Very quickly thereafter, construction activity picked up and housing construction has been robust since. 30

31 FEI also analyses move in/out and disconnect data to see if there are any indicators that help 32 explain dips and increases in net additions. In 2020 we saw fewer disconnects but this appears 33 to be an anomaly as 2021 appears to show normal patterns of move in/out and disconnects.

34

35



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Page 11 Information Request (IR) No. 1

1 2

3

- 4.3 Please provide the monthly Residential Net customer additions over 2019 and 2020.
- 4 **Response:**
- 5 The following table shows the monthly residential net customer additions for 2019 and 2020.

FEI Rate 1	Customer Additions	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total Additions
	2019	1,802	797	459	174	43	(137)	(53)	425	956	2,366	1,869	1,908	10,609
	2020	1,444	1,006	453	914	827	860	753	759	392	1,860	1,862	1,865	12,995

- 6 7
- 8
- 9

11

12

- 10
- 4.4 What activities have the builders/developers undertaken to adjust their operations and which resulted in increased customer additions? Please explain.
- 13 Response:

14 During the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic, like many businesses, builders and the real 15 estate industry were faced with significant challenges related to the transmission of COVID-19.

16 Once appropriate rules and BC Health order protocols were put in place to avoid the transmission

17 of COVID-19, both industries adapted to the situation swiftly. The COVID-19 pandemic also

18 created an environment where demand for new housing accelerated. Homes began selling faster

19 and for more money, driven by factors such as the desire of condo owners to move to the suburbs

20 once working from home became an option, and the overall demand for housing outstripping 21 supply. Builders reacted to the surge in demand and accelerated existing projects and brought

- 22 new projects forward sooner. As a result, FEI also saw increased demand.
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 4.5 Please elaborate on how working from home would likely result in fewer 27 disconnections.
- 28
- 29 **Response:**

30 FEI's observation that working from home would likely result in fewer disconnections is anecdotal, 31 as FEI has not performed any formal surveys on this topic. However, FEI considers that it is a 32 reasonable conclusion that the pandemic, and the resulting increase in the population working 33 from home, has had an impact on customer behavior, including their disconnections from gas 34 service in 2020 as explained further below.

35 FEI observed fewer seasonal disconnects in summer 2020 than other years, but FEI does not 36 know empirically if it was because of working from home. While working from home, people are 37 likely to rely more on space heating and the convenience afforded by natural gas equipment than 38 they otherwise would have, and they may therefore be less likely to seasonally disconnect.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Page 12 Information Request (IR) No. 1

1 In addition, to support customers during the pandemic, FEI paused disconnections for financial

2 reasons in March 2020 and throughout the remainder of the year, which may have also had an

3 impact on overall customer movement in 2020.

4 Finally, during the COVID-19 pandemic, many customers that otherwise would have disconnected

5 while they left the country to vacation in warmer climates during the winter stayed at home in 2020/2021.

6



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 13

#### 1 5. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 16

#### 3.3.1.2 Residential UPC

The residential UPC forecast was developed using the ETS method with the most recent 10 years of historical weather-normalized UPC, described in Appendix A3.

As shown in Figure 3-3, the residential UPC is forecast to decrease by approximately 0.1 GJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.

90. 85.7 83.1 80 -70. 60 -3 50-0d 40 -30 -20. 10 0-84.4 84.2 84.1 85.8 85.1 82.4 86.2 86.3 87.6 84.7 84.2 87 5 2015 2013 2017 2018 2012 2014 2016 2019 2020 2011 2021 2022 Year Actual Forecast Seed Approved



#### 3

- 4

5.1 Is Figure 3-3 UPC weather-normalized?

5 6

5.1.1 If not, please provide weather-normalized data for Figure 3-3.

### 7 **Response:**

- 8 Confirmed. The RS 1 UPC shown in Figure 3-3 is weather-normalized.
- 9



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 6. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 17 and page 18

#### 3.3.2 Commercial

#### 3.3.2.1 Commercial Customers

The commercial net customer additions forecast is based on the average of the actual net customer additions over the last three years for which a full year of actual data is available (i.e., 2018 to 2020). As there has been a relatively large migration of Rate Schedule 23 transportation customers to bundled service under Rate Schedule 3 since 2019, these two rate classes were forecast together as "large commercial" and the total allocated to the two rate classes proportional to the current composition.

With respect to the discrepancy between the 2020 Approved and 2020 Actual commercial customer additions, the commercial customer segment is very diverse and as a result it is difficult to pinpoint specific trends. However, the COVID-19 pandemic likely had impacts on many commercial segments that resulted in lower customer additions. For example, restrictions imposed by the pandemic adversely impacted the operation and viability of customers in the tourism, hotel and restaurant sectors.

As shown in Figure 3-5 below, commercial customer additions are forecast to remain flat in 2022F.



Figure 3-5: Commercial Net Customers Additions

4 5 6

7

2

3

6.1 Please provide the rate schedules that are included in the Commercial demand figures.

#### 8 Response:

9 Commercial demand includes demand from rate schedules 2, 3 and 23.



1														
2														
3 4	6.2	Please pro	ovide A	pprove	ed custo	omer a	ddition	s for 20	019.					
5 6	Response:													
7 8	The 2019 app customers.	proved custo	omer a	ddition	s forec	ast for	the cor	nmerci	ial cus	tomer c	lasses	s was 1	1,222	
9 10														
11 12 13 14	6.3	Please pro and 2021.	ovide tl	he con	nmercia	al net d	custom	ier add	litions	monthl	y for 2	2019, 2	2020,	
15	<u>Response:</u>													
16 17	The following 2021. The ful	table shows I year net cu	s mont ustome	hly cor er addit	mmerci ions fo	ial net or 2021	custon will be	ner ado availa	ditions ble in (	for 201 Q1 of 2	9, 202 022.	20 and	YTD	
	Commercial Customer Ac	dditions January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total Additions
		2019 268	135	79	(106)	(149)	(160)	(59)	(23)	(57)	251	187	244	610
		2020 118	19	(54)	(188)	(111)	50	55	86	(50)	142	159	158	384

	2013	200	133	12	(100)	(142)	(100)	(35)	(25)	(37)	201	107	244	010
	2020	118	19	(54)	(188)	(111)	50	55	86	(50)	142	159	158	384
18	YTD 2021	64	94	93	(67)	(127)	(47)	(54)	(30)					
10														
19														
10														
20														
21														
22	64 Con	eidorin	a that	FFI'e	formul	aic rev		roquire	mont	is offo	ctad h	v cuet	omer	
22	0.4 CON	ISIUCIIII	y mai		Ionnu		/enue	require	ment	is alle	cieu b	y cusi	JUEI	
23	add	itions, j	olease	describ	be the d	overall	ratepa	yer imp	bact of	custom	ner add	litions b	being	
24	sign	ificantl		r than f	orocas	t such		currod	in 202	0 and 4	2021		Ŭ	
24	Sign	mcanti	y iowe	i uiali i	UIECas	n, suci	1 23 00	cuneu	11 202	u anu i	2021.			
25														

## 26 Response:

FEI's total actual net customer additions in 2020 were higher than the original forecast, rather than lower as indicated in the question. The 12-month actual average net customers for 2020 was 1,044,623, while the 12-month average originally forecast in FEI's Annual Review for 2020 and 2021 Delivery Rates was 1,043,259 net customers. Similarly, FEI's projected 12-month average net customers for 2021 of 1,057,078 in this Application is also projected to be higher than the original forecast 2021 average net customers of 1,053,292 from the FEI Annual Review for 2020 and 2021 Delivery Rates.

As approved by the MRP Decision and Order G-165-20, FEI's formula O&M and formula growth capital includes a true-up mechanism (positive or negative) based on average customer counts and gross customer additions, respectively. Tables 6-2 and 7-2 of the Application demonstrate

37 the 2022 true-up of FEI's formula O&M and FEI's formula growth capital, respectively, due to



1 variances between forecast and actual customers from 2020 (i.e., two-year lag as actual is 2 required for true-up). Please refer to the responses to BCOAPO IR1 8.1 and 14.1 for the 3 incremental revenue and delivery margin for the variance in average customer additions and 4 gross customer additions, respectively. For 2021, the variance in customer additions between 5 forecast and actual results will be trued-up in FEI's Annual Review for 2023 Delivery Rates.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Page 17 Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 7. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, pages 18 and 19

#### 3.3.2.2 Commercial UPC

The commercial UPC forecast was developed using the ETS method, considering the most recent 10 years of historical weather-normalized UPC.

As shown in Figure 3-6, the Rate Schedule 2 UPC is forecast to decrease by 0.9 GJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.



Figure 3-6: Rate Schedule 2 UPC

As shown in Figure 3-7, the Rate Schedule 3 UPC is forecast to decrease by approximately 8.0 GJs in 2022F compared to 2021S.

3

- 4
- 5 6

7.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that the use of historical data for forecasting, whether the ETS or other methodology, does not necessarily account for extraordinary events, such as the pandemic, which can cause the values to be 7 inappropriately skewed.

8

#### 9 **Response:**

10 Confirmed. However, the ETS method makes use of 10 years of forecast data and dynamically

11 determines how much emphasis to place on recent data versus the long-term trend. When recent

12 data varies significantly from prior years, the ETS method is designed to place less emphasis on

13 this data and rely more on the long-term trend.

14 The following chart shows the aggregate demand forecast variance for the last 10 years.



 FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)
 Submission Date:

 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)
 September 28, 2021

 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)
 Page 18

- 1 Despite the pandemic impacting most of 2020, the aggregate forecast variance was just -1.3
- 2 percent, which was the second lowest variance recorded in the last 10 years. The 2020 forecast
- 3 was prepared with actual data through 2018, and was the first forecast to use the ETS method to
- 4 forecast both residential and commercial use rates.





Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Page 19 Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 **Response:**

- 2 The preamble refers to both Figure 3-6 (RS 2) and Figure 3-7 (RS 3) so FEI has provided data
- 3 for both rate schedules.

4 The following table provides the monthly, weather-normalized use rates for RS 2 and RS 3 for

5 2019, 2020 and YTD 2021. The full year 2021 use rates will be available in Q1 of 2022.

	Rate Schedule	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
2019	RS 2	51.7	40.0	34.6	23.4	14.8	10.8	8.9	8.9	11.3	22.4	34.4	56.8	318.1
	RS 3	484.4	407.5	383.6	295.1	203.9	153.3	130.0	127.1	155.4	262.2	352.3	562.0	3,516.7
2020	RS 2	52.5	46.8	34.1	22.3	13.3	10.2	8.2	7.9	11.3	23.6	38.8	53.3	322.2
	RS 3	508.2	485.6	400.8	293.9	201.5	162.0	131.7	124.6	166.8	286.1	404.4	494.6	3,660.3
2021 YTD	RS 2	52.7	45.7	36.7	23.9	13.4	12.9	12.3						
	RS 3	509.8	458.3	417.7	302.9	200.6	181.0	170.4						

6



3.3

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)

Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 20

#### 1 8. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix A2, Percent Error Data Tables, Table 3.3

AMALGAMATED NORMALIZED USE PER CUSTOMER

#### 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 Rate Schedule 1 Forecast 86.5 86.3 85.2 86.0 83.1 81.6 82.2 89.1 87.0 85.7 84.2 84.4 Actual 86.3 87.6 84.7 87.5 85.8 85.1 82.4 86.2 Error = (ACT-FCST) 5.9 3.7 (0.2)1.3 (0.5)(1.8)1.3 (4.0)(4.6)0.4 Percent Error = (Error/ACT) -0.2% 1.5% -0.6% -2.1% 1.5% 6.7% 4.3% -4.7% -5.6% 0.5% 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 Rate Schedule 2 Forecast 320.2 315.0 314.5 340.0 333.7 329.5 328.4 345.2 341.3 324.9 Actual 317.7 341.2 331.6 330.6 332.6 339.1 336.8 332.5 318.1 322.2 Error = (ACT-FCST) (2.5)17.1 (9.4) 9.6 (23.2) 26.2 (1.1)8.3 (12.7)(2.7)Percent Error = (Error/ACT) -0.8% 7.7% 5.2% -2.8% -0.3% 2.8% 2.5% -3.8% -7.3% -0.8% 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 Rate Schedule 3 Forecast 3,487 3,450 3,435 3,872 3,754 3,593 3,488 3,842 3,831 3,648 Actual 3,588 3,684 3,610 3,573 3,587 3,721 3,692 3,550 3,517 3,660 Error = (ACT-FCST) 101 234 175 (299) (167) 128 205 (292) (314) 12 Percent Error = (Error/ACT) 2.8% 6.4% 4.8% -8.4% -4.7% 3.4% 5.5% -8.2% -8.9% 0.3% 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 Rate Schedule 23 Forecast 4,680 4,901 4,927 5,546 5,309 5,382 5,227 5,399 5,492 5,480 5,174 5,345 5,441 Actual 5,138 5,238 5,149 5,260 5,279 5,361 5,051 Error = (ACT-ECST)458 337 222 (286) (135)(103)133 (54) (440) (39) 8.9% -5.4% Percent Error = (Error/ACT) 6.4% 4.3% -2.6% -2.0% 2.5% -1.0% -8.7% -0.7%

From an MRP formula perspective, what is the ratepayer impact of the whole of Residential and Commercial UPC being over- or under-estimated by 5%, 8% or

2

3

4

5

6

## 7 Response:

8.1

10%? Please explain.

FEI notes that its demand forecast is not under an MRP formula. Rather, FEI forecasts demandannually in determining its revenue requirements.

Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 7.1, including Attachment 7.1, for the ratepayer impact of the over- or under-estimated scenarios. All else being equal, the scenarios of residential and commercial UPC being over- or under-estimated (i.e., the scenarios contemplated in CEC IR1 8.1) are directly proportional to residential and commercial demand being over- or underestimated by the same percentage amount, and thus will result in the same ratepayer impact regardless if the variance occurred in UPC or in the overall demand.





Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1 Submission Date: September 28, 2021

Page 21

#### 1 9. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix A2, Percent Error Data Tables Table 3.4

#### 3.4 AMALGAMATED DEMAND

Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate Schedule 1										
Forecast	73.8	74.7	74.6	74.2	73.1	72.5	74.3	81.2	80.8	81.1
Actual	73.9	74.5	72.7	73.2	74.1	77.9	77.5	78.3	77.0	81.6
Error = (ACT-FCST)	0.1	(0.2)	(1.9)	(1.0)	1.0	5.4	3.3	(2.9)	(3.7)	0.5
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	0.1%	-0.3%	-2.6%	-1.4%	1.3%	6.9%	4.2%	-3.7%	-4.9%	0.6%
Demand PIs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Bate Schedule 2	2011	LUIL	2010	2021	2010	2010	2017	2010	2015	LULU
Forecast	27.7	26.9	26.9	27.7	28.1	28.0	28.5	30.3	30.2	28.9
Actual	27.1	20.5	20.5	27.5	28.0	29.0	20.5	29.1	28.1	28.7
Frror = (ACT-FCST)	(0.6)	0.7	0.1	(0.2)	(0.1)	1.0	0.6	(1.2)	(2.1)	(0.2)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	-2.2%	2.5%	0.4%	-0.7%	-0.4%	3.4%	2.0%	-4.3%	-7.4%	-0.8%
			I	I		I	I			
Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate Schedule 3										
Forecast	19.9	19.1	19.1	19.9	19.2	18.1	18.7	20.1	21.5	25.2
Actual	19.5	19.3	18.7	18.5	19.2	19.4	19.7	20.9	22.5	24.6
Error = (ACT-FCST)	(0.4)	0.2	(0.4)	(1.4)	(0.0)	1.3	1.0	0.9	1.0	(0.6)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	-2.1%	1.0%	-2.1%	-7.6%	-0.2%	6.7%	5.2%	4.1%	4.3%	-2.4%
Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate Schedule 23										
Forecast	6.2	7.2	7.5	8.7	8.3	9.0	9.2	10.3	9.6	4.8
Actual	7.4	7.8	7.9	8.0	8.6	9.3	9.5	9.0	7.3	4.6
Error = (ACT-FCST)	1.2	0.6	0.4	(0.7)	0.3	0.3	0.4	(1.3)	(2.3)	(0.2)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	16.2%	7.7%	5.1%	-8.7%	3.5%	3.2%	3.9%	-13.9%	-31.3%	-5.2%
					,	,				
Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Commercial										
Forecast	53.8	53.2	53.5	56.3	55.6	55.1	56.4	60.7	61.3	59.0
Actual	54.0	54.7	53.6	54.0	55.8	57.7	58.3	59.0	57.9	57.9
Error = (ACT-FCST)	0.2	1.5	0.1	(2.3)	0.2	2.6	2.0	(1.6)	(3.4)	(1.1)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	0.4%	2.7%	0.2%	-4.3%	0.3%	4.5%	3.4%	-2.8%	-5.9%	-1.9%

2

3

4

9.1 From an MRP formula perspective, what is the ratepayer impact of the whole of Residential and Commercial Demand being over- or under-estimated by 5%, 8% or 10%? Please explain.

5 6

#### 7 Response:

FEI notes that its demand forecast is not under an MRP formula. Rather, FEI forecasts demandannually in determining its revenue requirements.

10 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 7.1, including Attachment 7.1, for the ratepayer impact

11 of the over- or under-estimated scenarios.



Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)

Page 22

#### 1 10. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix A2, Table 3.4 Excerpt page 8

Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate 5										
Forecast	5.2	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.5	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.9	7.6
Actual	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.4	2.3	2.4	2.8	3.8	4.8	8.1
Error = (ACT-FCST)	(0.9)	0.0	(0.2)	(0.5)	(1.2)	0.3	0.7	1.3	1.9	0.5
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	-21%	0%	-5%	-15%	-52%	11%	23%	34%	40%	6%
Demand Die	2011	2012	2012	2014	2015	2010	2017	2010	2010	2020
Demand, PJS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate 25	12.0	42.4	42.5	42.2	42.0	12.0	42.0		11.0	40.0
Forecast	13.8	13.4	13.5	13.3	13.9	13.8	13.8	14.4	14.8	10.3
Actual	13.2	12.9	13.1	13.4	13.7	13.9	14.5	13.9	13.2	9.9
Error = (ACT-FCST)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.4)	0.1	(0.2)	0.1	0.7	(0.5)	(1.7)	(0.4)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	-5%	-4%	-3%	1%	-1%	1%	5%	-3%	-13%	-4%
Demand PIs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate 22	2011	2012	2010	2011	2010	2010	2017	2010	2015	2020
Forecast	27.1	29.7	29.6	43.2	33.2	36.3	38.2	38.5	43.3	41.0
Actual	34.9	38.0	36.4	36.0	37.0	40.5	40.9	42.0	43.3	39.0
Error = (ACT-FCST)	7.8	8.3	6.8	(7.2)	3.8	4.2	2.6	3.5	0.1	(2.0)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	22%	22%	19%	-20%	10%	10%	6%	8%	0%	-5%
Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Rate 27										
Forecast	5.6	5.8	5.8	6.5	6.6	6.5	6.4	7.3	7.9	4.7
Actual	6.6	6.4	7.5	6.6	7.2	6.8	7.5	6.2	5.9	4.6
Error = (ACT-FCST)	1.0	0.6	1.7	0.1	0.5	0.3	1.1	(1.1)	(2.0)	(0.1)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	15%	9%	23%	2%	7%	4%	14%	-17%	-34%	-1%
Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Industrial*										
Forecast	71.3	72.1	72.1	86.2	76.4	78.1	82.1	84.3	90.6	91.9
Actual	78.8	80.6	80.1	78.6	79.6	83.7	87.4	88.4	91.5	89.5
Error = (ACT-FCST)	7.5	8.5	8.0	(7.6)	3.2	5.6	5.3	4.2	0.9	(2.4)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	9.5%	10.5%	10.0%	-9.7%	4.0%	6.7%	6.0%	4.7%	1.0%	-2.7%

2

## 3 4

10.1 Please identify which Rate Classes are included in 'Industrial'.

## 5 **Response:**

6 For the purposes of the tables in Section 3.4 of Appendix A2, as referenced in the preamble 7 above, the "Industrial" rate classes include RS 4 to 7, 22, 25, 27, and all bypass and special rates,

- 8 but exclude NGT customers (CNG and LNG) under RS 3, 5, 23, 25 and 46.
- 9
- 10
- 11 12

13

- 10.2 From an MRP formula perspective, what is the ratepayer impact of the whole of Industrial Demand being over- or under-estimated by 5%, 8% or 10%? Please explain.
- 14 15

## 16 **Response:**

17 FEI notes that its demand forecast is not under an MRP formula. Rather, FEI forecasts demand

18 annually in determining its revenue requirements.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Submission Date:

2021

- Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 7.1, including Attachment 7.1, for the ratepayer impact 1
- 2 of the over- or under-estimated scenarios.



Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)

Submission Date:

September 28,

#### 1 11. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix A2, Percent Error Data Table Excerpt page 8

Demand, PJs	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Commercial										
Forecast	53.8	53.2	53.5	56.3	55.6	55.1	56.4	60.7	61.3	59.0
Actual	54.0	54.7	53.6	54.0	55.8	57.7	58.3	59.0	57.9	57.9
Error = (ACT-FCST)	0.2	1.5	0.1	(2.3)	0.2	2.6	2.0	(1.6)	(3.4)	(1.1)
Percent Error = (Error/ACT)	0.4%	2.7%	0.2%	-4.3%	0.3%	4.5%	3.4%	-2.8%	-5.9%	-1.9%

- 2
- 2
- 3
- 11.1 From an MRP formula perspective, what is the ratepayer impact of the whole of FEI Demand being over- or under-estimated by 5%, 8% or 10%? Please explain.
- 4 5

### 6 Response:

2

FEI notes that its demand forecast is not under an MRP formula. Rather, FEI forecasts demandannually in determining its revenue requirements.

9 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 7.1, including Attachment 7.1, for the ratepayer impact

10 of the over- or under-estimated scenarios.



3

4

5

#### 1 12. Reference: Exhibit B-2, pages 18, 18, 19, 20 and 21

As shown in Figure 3-5 below, commercial customer additions are forecast to remain flat in 2022F.

As shown in Figure 3-6, the Rate Schedule 2 UPC is forecast to decrease by 0.9 GJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.

As shown in Figure 3-7, the Rate Schedule 3 UPC is forecast to decrease by approximately 8.0 GJs in 2022F compared to 2021S.

As shown in Figure 3-8, the Rate Schedule 23 UPC is forecast to decrease by 1.5 GJs in 2022F compared to 2021S.

#### 3.3.2.3 Commercial Demand

Taking into account the customer additions and UPC forecasts described above, and as seen in Figure 3-9 below, commercial demand is forecast to increase by 0.6 PJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.

12.1 The CEC notes that Commercial customer additions are forecast to remain flat, and the UPC for RS 2, 3 and 23 are forecast to decrease. Please briefly explain why overall demand is expected to increase.

#### 9 10

6 7

8

#### 11 Response:

12 The commercial demand forecast is the product of the number of customers and use rates.

The customer forecast is the sum of customer additions and the prior year customer total.Customer additions are flat, but positive. As a result, the customer total is increasing.

The increased customer total, coupled with the slight decline in use rates, results in an increaseddemand forecast.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 13. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 22 and 23

#### 3.3.3 Industrial Demand

The 2022F demand for industrial customers was forecast using the Industrial Survey.

For the 2022 Forecast, customers responded to the survey in June and July of 2021. The survey was launched as close as possible to the filing date to mitigate potential variances in the forecast, particularly from Rate Schedule 22 customers. The survey needed to be completed by July 5, 2021 to allow sufficient time for internal review of the results, loading of data in FEI's Forecasting Information System (FIS), preparing the forecast and drafting the Application. Since the survey requires approximately five weeks to complete, it was launched on May 28, 2021.

As shown in Table 3-1 below, the response rate achieved in 2021 was 47.9 percent of industrial customers, representing approximately 90.0 percent of industrial volumes. There was no reply from 47.1 percent of industrial customers, who received the survey and three reminder notifications; this group represents only 9.2 percent of the industrial demand. Surveys could not be delivered to 5.0 percent of the industrial customers due to issues such as incorrect email addresses; this group represents 0.8 percent of the total industrial load.

2021 Industrial Survey	Description	Customers	Demand
Survey Completed	The survey was delivered and completed.	47.9%	90.0%
Survey delivered but not completed	The survey was delivered, but after three follow-up emails was not completed.	47.1%	9.2%
Survey undeliverable	The survey was not deliverable. This can be a result of invalid email addresses, faulty email servers etc.	5.0%	0.8%
	5017015000	5.676	5.676
Total		100.0%	100.0%

#### Table 3-1: Industrial Survey Response Rates

3 4

5

6

7

- 13.1 Please provide the Industrial Survey response rates from the last 5 years, as shown in Table 3-1.
  - 13.1.1 To the extent that FEI's response rate is lower, or substantially different this year, please provide any explanations that FEI has as to why this has occurred.

#### 8 9

### 10 **Response:**

Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 4.1. The response rate for this year's survey wasslightly higher than prior years.

13



#### 1 14. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 23

The forecast of demand for customers that either chose not to reply to the survey or could not be contacted (representing 10 percent of the total industrial demand) was set to equal 2020 Actual consumption.

14.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that setting the demand for customers that did not reply or could not be contacted at the previous year's actual, is standard practice for FEI and has been used in the past five years.

### 7 **Response:**

- 8 Confirmed.
- 9
- 10

2

3

4

5

6

- 11 12
- 14.2 Why could 5% of the customers not be contacted? What actions did FEI take in order to contact these customers?
- 13 14

#### 15 **Response:**

FEI suspects that a small percentage of customers each year have made changes to their email
systems, networks, servers, etc. that prevent email messages from being received. In addition,
some contacts take new positions and their email addresses are not forwarded.

FEI sends an introductory email prior to the survey to give respondents an opportunity to update their contact information. In many cases, emails sent to employees that are no longer with the customer are routed to administrators and others that are then able to provide updated information.

In cases where larger volume customers cannot be contacted, FEI staff connect with the customerby phone and then update the Industrial Survey database.

FEI does not believe it is cost-effective to pursue small volume customers that can no longer be contacted by email because they make up a very small portion of the customer count and the aggregate demand from this group is not material to the accuracy of the survey.

28
29
30
31 14.2.1 Please confirm or otherwise explain that FEI is confident that the 5% of customers who could not be contacted are still in business. Please explain why this is so.
34



#### 1 Response:

- 2 FEI is confident that the 5 percent of customers that cannot be contacted are still in business.
- 3 Prior to launching the Industrial Survey a database synchronization process is run to populate the
- 4 survey database with data from the billing system. In cases where customers have ceased
- 5 operation, their data is not synchronized to the survey database.
- 6



 FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)
 Submission Date:

 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)
 September 28, 2021

 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)
 Page 29

#### 1 15. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 23 and 24

As seen in Figure 3-10 below, the demand from the industrial rate schedules is forecast to increase by 0.3 PJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.



Figure 3-10: Industrial Demand<sup>10</sup>

3 4

15.1 Is Figure 3-10 weather-normalized?

15.1.1

5 6

#### 7 Response:

8 Industrial demand data is not weather normalized. FEI does not develop weather normalized 9 industrial data and is unable to provide such information. Developing weather normalization 10 factors for each region and rate class is highly complex and, due to the fact that industrial demand 11 is generally not sensitive to weather and that the industrial forecast is developed using a survey 12 and therefore does not use time series methods, FEI is able to prepare the annual industrial 13 forecast without the need to maintain normalization factors.

If not, please provide weather-normalized data.

- 15
- 16
- 17 15.2 For the last 5 years, please provide the weather-normalized results based on FEI's
   18 customer demand surveys, and the Actual weather-normalized results.
- 19

<sup>14</sup> 



### 1 Response:

2 Please refer to the response to CEC IR1 15.1.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 31

#### 1 16. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 23 and 24

As seen in Figure 3-10 below, the demand from the industrial rate schedules is forecast to increase by 0.3 PJ in 2022F compared to 2021S.



#### Figure 3-10: Industrial Demand<sup>10</sup>

3 4

16.1 Is Figure 3-10 weather-normalized?

5

16.1.1 If not, please provide weather-normalized data.

6

## 7 Response:

FEI notes that this information request appears to be a duplicate of CEC IR1 15.1 (and 15.1.1).
Please refer to the response to CEC IR1 15.1.

- 10
- 11
- 12 13

14

15

16.2 For the last 5 years, please provide the weather-normalized results based on FEI's customer demand surveys, and the Actual weather-normalized results.

## 16 **Response:**

FEI notes that this information request appears to be a duplicate of CEC IR1 15.2. Please referto the response to CEC IR1 15.2.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 17. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix B, page 2

The CMAE budget is required for FEI staff and resources that are necessary:

- to plan and optimize gas supply requirements and to prepare FEI's Annual Contracting • Plans:
- to secure and manage the gas supply resources on a daily basis and mitigate any unneeded resources:
- to establish appropriate contracts with counterparties and manage any associated credit exposure;
- to manage upstream regulatory developments in order to protect the interests of • customers, including minimizing unfavourable outcomes and identifying and supporting opportunities that are beneficial to customers; and
- to complete the support activities related to regulatory and financial reporting and other • compliance requirements.

Carrying out these responsibilities is critical given that the gross cost of the commodity and midstream gas supply portfolios is currently in excess of \$750 million per year. These costs can change dramatically given commodity price volatility and changes in transportation and storage costs.

- 4 17.1 Please confirm that FEI optimizes its gas supply to the greatest extent possible, 5 such that ratepayers will pay the lowest rate FEI is capable of delivering.
- 6 7

2

3

17.1.1 If not confirmed, please explain why not.

#### 8 **Response:**

9 Optimizing FEI's gas supply resources such that customers will pay the lowest rate FEI is capable 10 of delivering is an important consideration, but it is not the only priority. The main objective of 11 FEI's gas supply portfolio is to contract for resources that ensure an appropriate balance of 12 security, diversity and reliability of gas supply in order to meet core customers' forecast peak day 13 and annual load requirements, while minimizing the overall cost of the portfolio.

14 Since the October 9, 2018 pipeline rupture and the capacity restrictions imposed thereafter on 15 the Westcoast Energy Inc. T-South system, FEI has placed more emphasis on enhancing system resiliency within its portfolio. This includes holding excess T-South capacity as contingency 16 17 resources and increasing diversity of supply by taking back capacity on Southern Crossing 18 Pipeline (SCP), which had historically been contracted out to NW Natural. FEI is continuing to 19 look for options to mitigate future supply risks for core customers by creating more diversity, which 20 may increase the cost of the overall portfolio.

- 21
- 22
- 23



3

17.2 Please explain the gas supply optimization process and provide a quantitative example.

## 4 Response:

5 FEI contracts enough gas supply resources through its Annual Contracting Plan to meet the 6 forecast peak day, winter design, and annual load requirements of its core customers. This 7 creates a surplus of gas supply, transportation and storage capacity to sell at certain times of the 8 year, when customer demand is less than the amount of resources available. As a result, FEI 9 actively pursues opportunities throughout the gas year (November to October) to generate 10 revenue related to pipeline, storage, and off-system sales as part of the overall portfolio 11 optimization. Maximizing gas cost savings in the natural gas marketplace involves monitoring 12 market opportunities and developing strategies on an annual, seasonal, and daily basis to capture 13 value when opportunities arise. FEI provides the following two examples of optimizing the gas 14 supply portfolio on a daily and seasonal basis:

15 1. **Spot Commodity Resale Mitigation:** This transaction occurs when a surplus of supply 16 has been purchased in excess of what is needed to serve core load. When FEI has excess 17 supply, FEI has the option to sell it back at the same market hub, or transport it to sell to 18 a downstream market. FEI will look for transactions that yield the highest expected net-19 back value. For instance, if on a certain day, FEI has 20,000 gigajoules (GJs) of excess 20 supply at Station 2, and the Station 2 supply hub is trading at \$3.00 CAD/GJ and the 21 Huntingdon downstream market hub is trading at \$5.00 CAD/GJ, FEI could generate 22 revenue by capturing the spread between the two hubs net of variable costs (i.e., Fuel, 23 Motor Fuel Tax, and Carbon Tax). The calculated revenue of this example is provided 24 below:

Market Price at Huntingdon	\$5.00 CAD/G		
Station 2 Price	\$3.00	CAD/GJ	
T-South Fuel - 3%	\$0.09		
Motor Fuel and Carbon Tax	\$0.11		
Delivered Price at Huntingdon	\$3.20		
Commodity Resale Value	<u>\$1.80</u>		
Station 2 Excess Supply	20,000	GJs	
Commodity Resale Value	\$1.80		
Mitigation Revenue	\$36,000		

25

 Capacity Release Mitigation: FEI may also optimize its portfolio by mitigating unutilized transportation capacity by entering into Capacity Release transactions, whereby FEI
 releases capacity to a third party who then pays FEI for the right to use its transportation



2

3

4

5

Page 34

capacity. FEI typically transacts these arrangements during the summer season (April to October), as FEI's load is heat sensitive and therefore drops significantly during that time. An example of this would be releasing 20,000 GJs of Westcoast T-South capacity to a counterparty for the summer season for a negotiated price of \$0.25 CAD/GJ. The calculated revenue of this transaction is calculated below:

Capacity Release Volume	20,000 Gigajoules
Capacity Release Price	\$0.25 CAD/GJ
Summer Season	214 Days
Capacity Release Mitigation Revenue	\$1,070,000



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 35

#### 1 18. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 3 and 4

	Ар	pproved Projected 2021 2021		ojected 2021	Forecast 2022	
Labour	\$	3.041	\$	2.892	\$	3.038
Non-Labour		1.797		1.585		1.851
Shared Services		0.686		0.686		0.686
Total CMAE	\$	5.524	\$	5.163	\$	5.575

#### Table B-1: CMAE Summary (\$ millions)

#### 1.3 REGULATORY TREATMENT OF CMAE

The forecast CMAE costs are included as a component of the forecast gas costs for the purposes of determining the commodity and midstream (storage and transport) cost recovery charges.

Variances between the actual gas costs incurred and the forecast gas costs embedded in recovery rates are captured in the gas cost deferral accounts and, subject to BCUC approval, these variances are refunded to or recovered from customers as part of future commodity and midstream rates.

At the end of each year, the Company files its gas cost status report with the BCUC, which provides a summary of the cost and recovery variances and provides explanations for any material variances. The actual year-end 2021 CMAE costs and variances to the approved budget will be submitted, in the format prescribed by the BCUC, as part of the FEI 2021 CCRA and MCRA Status Report due to be filed by April 30, 2022.

- 18.1 Please confirm the CEC's understanding that if FEI does not spend the full CMAE
  budget, the variance will be refunded to customers the following year, subject to
  BCUC approval.
- 7

3

2

#### 8 Response:

9 FEI confirms that variances related to actual costs being lower than the CMAE budget are

10 captured in the gas cost deferral accounts and are fully refunded to customers as part of future

11 rates.


Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 36

# 1 19. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix B, page 4

# 1.5 FORECAST 2022 CMAE COSTS

As reflected in Schedule 1 in the 2022 Budget Request column, the Company is seeking approval of the 2022 CMAE budget in the amount of \$5.575 million, which is \$0.051 million higher than 2021 Approved. The increase from 2021 Approved is primarily related to inflation based on the forecast labour and non-labour inflation factors. As well, the forecast includes changes in the service level related to various non-labour components that have been identified. Explanations of the 2022 CMAE budget by cost component are set out below.

- 2
- 3
- 4

19.1 Is FEI required to use the Inflation Factors approved for the MRP in the Forecast CMAE costs? Please explain why or why not.

5

# 6 **Response:**

No. Consistent with past practice, the 2022 CMAE forecast costs have been developed using a
bottom-up approach, which requires more lead time than using a formulaic approach. The 2022
CMAE forecast is based on the information available at the time the forecast was prepared. Inputs
include forecast labour and non-labour inflation factors, forecast US exchange rate, as well as the
cost impacts for known contractual increases related to multiyear service agreements and for
changes in the service / activity levels related to various non-labour components.

FEI notes that the 2022 CMAE budget amount requested based on the bottom-up approach is less than 1 percent higher than the 2021 Approved amount and, subject to BCUC approval, variances between the actual and approved amounts are flowed back to customers as part of future rates.

FEI believes its current approach to developing the annual CMAE forecast is reasonable. However, pursuant to Order G-319-20 in FEI's 2020 and 2021 Annual Review, FEI is directed to include in its next revenue requirements or MRP application following the MRP term, a comprehensive review of the CMAE costs, including consideration of whether these costs are conducive to a formulaic approach or whether they should continue to be forecast with flowthrough treatment, and whether the current allocation percentages to the CCRA and MCRA remain appropriate.

- 24
- 25
- ~ ~
- 26 27
- 28
- 29

19.2 If no, what other inflation component factors might FEI consider it reasonable to use? Please explain.

- 30 <u>Response:</u>
- 31 Please refer to the response to CEC IR1 19.1.
- 32



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 20. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, Appendix B, page 4

#### 1.5 FORECAST 2022 CMAE COSTS

As reflected in Schedule 1 in the 2022 Budget Request column, the Company is seeking approval of the 2022 CMAE budget in the amount of \$5.575 million, which is \$0.051 million higher than 2021 Approved. The increase from 2021 Approved is primarily related to inflation based on the forecast labour and non-labour inflation factors. As well, the forecast includes changes in the service level related to various non-labour components that have been identified. Explanations of the 2022 CMAE budget by cost component are set out below.

2

# 1.5.1 Information Systems (IS)

The 2022 Forecast Information Systems (IS) budget of \$0.322 million is \$0.192 million lower than 2021 Approved. As indicated in Schedule 1, 2021 continues to be a transition year related to the replacement of the current Entegrate deal capture system with a new Energy Trading and Risk Management (ETRM) system. During the transition period, software maintenance and support costs have been incurred on both systems and were anticipated to continue until the new system is fully functional and the Entegrate system can be retired. Although FEI is not expected to complete its transition to the new ETRM system until late 2021 and retire the

3

Entegrate system in 2022, FEI has been able to reduce the level and cost of support related to the Entegrate system earlier than anticipated. The lower cost forecasts related to the cancellation of the Entegrate software support contract are embedded in both the 2021 Projected and the 2022 Budget Request amounts.

4 5 6

7

What was the total cost of the Energy Trading and Risk Management ("ETRM") 20.1 System?

#### 8 **Response:**

9 The budgeted capital cost for the implementation of the new ETRM system for FEI's Gas Supply 10 business area is approximately \$4.3 million. The system configuration and implementation work

11 is expected to continue through the remainder of 2021, with the transition from the current

12 Entegrate system to the new ETRM being completed in early 2022.

13 The forecast capital costs for implementation of the ETRM system are included in FEI's 14 Information Systems (IS) Capital, which is part of FEI's approved regular sustainment and other 15 capital expenditures<sup>3</sup>. The CMAE IS budget amount funds the Gas Supply department's 16 operating costs for the support and maintenance of a number of systems directly related to 17 managing the Gas Supply business.

18

Regular sustainment and other capital forecasts for 2020-2022 were approved as part of the MRP Decision and Order G-165-20, p. 131.



1			
2 3 4	20.2	Did the the Ord	Commission approve the replacement system? Please explain and provide er if this was approved.
5	Response:		
6 7 8 9 10	The replacen forecasts in t 2022 include (see page 13 part of the ap	nent syst he MRP the IS ca 1). The i proved si	em was included as part of FEI's regular sustainment and other capital Application. The regular sustainment/other capital forecasts for 2020 to pital and were approved as part of the MRP Decision and Order G-165-20 replacement ETRM system project is funded through the IS capital that is ustainment/other capital forecast.
11			
12 13			
14 15 16	20.3	Over w	nat period of time does FEI expect the ETRM system to be implemented?
17	<u>Response:</u>		
18	Please refer t	to the res	ponse to CEC IR1 20.1.
19 20			
21 22	20.4	Did FEI	ever provide an expected figure for 2022?
23		20.4.1	If yes, please provide.
24 25			20.4.1.1 Please explain any variances between any 2022 expected cost figures that FEI provided in the past.
26		20.4.2	If not please explain why not.
27 28	Response:		
29 30 31	The 2022 CN reviewed as p directives, su	IAE forect part of an Ibmits its	ast costs, submitted as part of this Application, have not been submitted or y previous filing. Consistent with current regulatory procedure and BCUC CMAE budget request for the upcoming year as part of the FEI annual

32

review.



#### 1 21. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, Appendix B, page 5

# 1.5.3 Subscriptions & Memberships

The 2022 Forecast for Subscriptions & Memberships of \$0.629 million has increased compared to 2021 Approved. The budget is based on the forecast costs for the required service levels and continues to include savings related to sharing the costs of some subscriptions with Aitken Creek Gas Storage ULC (ACGS). The 2022 Forecast includes inflationary increases to the various subscriptions and membership dues, as well as the contractual increases that are related to sole source subscriptions for commodity price services.

2 3

- 21.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that FEI has not included inflationary increases in those instances where contractual increases are already in place.
- 4 5

#### 6 Response:

7 Confirmed.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 40

# 1 22. Reference: Exhibit B-2, Appendix B, page 6

# 1.5.6 MoveUP Labour

The 2022 Forecast for MoveUP Labour of \$0.638 million has increased slightly compared to the 2021 Approved amount. The 2022 Forecast is based on the forecast of labour, including cross-charging, inflation, and benefits loadings.

# 1.5.7 M&E Labour

The 2022 Forecast for M&E Labour of \$2.400 million has decreased slightly compared to the 2021 Approved amount. The 2022 Forecast is based on the forecast of labour, including cross-charging, inflation, and benefits loadings.

- 2
- 22.1 Please explain what is meant by 'cross charging'.
- 3 4

# 5 **Response:**

6 Cross charges occur when an employee does work for a cost centre / business area that is not 7 their home cost centre / business area. For example, if an employee's home cost centre is the 8 CMAE cost centre but some of their work hours are spent on activities for another business area 9 and the work is not related to the Gas Supply function, cross charging would occur. The hours 10 worked on such activities are then, via employee timesheets, coded and charged to the 11 appropriate cost centre / business area.

- 12
- 13
- . .
- 14 15

22.2 Please explain why the forecast for MoveUp Labour increases and the M&E Labour decreases using the same inputs.

16 17

# 18 **Response:**

The approach to forecasting the MoveUP Labour and the M&E Labour budget is the same;however, some of the assumptions and inputs vary.

The 2022 MoveUP Labour included forecast increases related to both labour inflation and benefits loading factors. As well, there were no material changes to the budgeted positions and associated salary pay groupings, or to the forecast level of cross charging.

On the other hand, the 2022 M&E Labour forecast labour inflation factor was largely offset by a decrease in the benefit loading factor. As well, there were some additional forecast reductions related to changes to the budgeted M&E positions and associated salary levels, as vacancies have been filled; the 2022 M&E Labour budget reflects the forecast staffing requirements net of the forecast level of cross charging.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 23. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 32

Tanker Rental Revenue	2021	Approved	2021	Projected	2022	2 Forecast
Standard Tanker Rental Deliveries		360		360		240
Rate (\$/Delivery)	\$	295	\$	295	\$	301
Sub Total (\$ millions)	\$	0.106	\$	0.106	\$	0.072
Tridem Tanker Rental Deliveries		-		-		-
Rate (\$/Delivery)	\$	353	\$	353	\$	360
Sub Total (\$ millions)	Ś	-	\$	-	\$	-
Marine Equipped Tridem Tanker Rental Deliveries		1,344		1,416		1,688
Rate (\$/Delivery)	S	497	\$	497	\$	507
Sub Total (\$ millions)	S	0.668	\$	0.704	\$	0.856
Total Tanker Rental Revenue (\$ millions)	\$	0.774	\$	0.810	\$	0.928

#### Table 5-4: LNG Tanker Rental Revenue (\$ millions)

For the Standard tankers, the 2021 Projected rental revenue is forecast to be the same as the 2021 Approved. For 2022, FEI is forecasting the Standard tanker rental revenue to be reduced from the 2021 level, primarily due to a reduction of high pressure direct injection (HPDI) LNG vehicles on the road, as no equivalent commercially available engine is available on the market today.

For Tridem tankers, the 2021 Approved rental revenue is zero since these tankers are primarily used for long haul deliveries in Canada, such as to the Yukon, and these tankers are not permitted in the US (due to weight restrictions in the US). FEI does not expect Canadian deliveries to occur outside of British Columbia and is therefore expecting the 2021 Projected and 2022 Forecast Tridem tanker rental revenue to be zero.

For the Marine tankers, the 2021 Projected rental revenue is forecast to be slightly higher than the 2021 Approved, as the number of rental deliveries increased by 72. For 2022, FEI forecasts 272 additional marine tanker deliveries due to increased vessel consumption and additional vessels put into service.

3 4

2

5 6

Please briefly provide background information on the reduction of LNG vehicles on 23.1 the road. Are these vehicles expected to decline over the future? Please explain.

#### 7 **Response:**

8 FEI is currently experiencing a reduction in LNG demand for the heavy duty high horsepower LNG 9 vehicle segment, as the 15L engines, which provided the required horsepower for these heavy 10 duty trucks carrying payloads of up to 120,000 lbs on mountainous terrain, are no longer 11 commercially available and these have been the primary driver of on-road LNG 12 demand. Westport supplied the High Pressure Direct Injection (HPDI) engines for nearly all the 13 existing LNG heavy duty trucks and stopped taking orders for these engines in late 14 2013. However, there is currently a 12L LNG fueled engine available from Cummins-Westport, 15 which has been taken up by one customer so far, and its performance is being evaluated. Further, 16 there are promising signs that a replacement heavy duty high horsepower engine will return to 17 the Canadian marketplace in the 2024 time frame.



- 23.2 Please provide a description of a Marine Equipped Tridem Tanker as compared to a Tridem Tanker.
- 5 6

3 4

# 7 Response:

8 The Tridem Tanker is similar to a Standard Tanker but with more carrying capacity. The Tridem 9 Tanker has a capacity of approximately 16,000 US gallons compared to a Standard Tanker that 10 has a capacity of approximately 11,000 US gallons. As is the case for the Standard Tanker, the 11 Tridem Tanker has a pneumatic Emergency Shut-Down (ESD) system, a pressure building coil

12 and the necessary valves, gauges and instruments to perform pressure transfers over ground

13 and in open spaces.

The Marine Equipped Tridem Tanker includes an internal LNG pump, electronic emergency shutdown systems, a ship to tanker interconnection system (including 600 and 24 volts), gas and temperature sensors, other instruments and control devices and additional valves specifically designed and located to ensure the safe offload of LNG while the tanker is on board the receiving vessel.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)

Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 24. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, page 38 and 38

Table 6 2	System Operation	o Intogrity	and Coourity	Now/Incremental	Coording (C	millione)
Table 0-3.	system Operation	is, integrity a	and Security	New/incremental	spending (\$	minons)

Line No.		Appr	oved Base O&M	2	020 Formula O&M <sup>1</sup>	A	ctual 2020 O&M	Fo	2020 recast/Actual Variance	Fo	Cumulative precast/Actual Variance <sup>2</sup>
1	Integrity Management	\$	1.350	\$	1.381	\$	1.147	\$	(0.234)	\$	(0.234)
2	Maintaining System Infrastructure		0.700		0.716		0.729		0.013		0.013
3	Operations, Compliance and Safety		0.600		0.614		0.704		0.090		0.090
4	Cyber Security		0.508		0.520		1.130		0.610		0.610
5	Data Analytics		0.300		0.307		-		(0.307)		(0.307)
6	Gas Control		0.650		0.665		-		(0.665)		(0.665)
7	CEPA Participation		0.700		0.716		0.475		(0.241)		(0.241)
8	Other		-		-		-		-		-
9	Total	\$	4.808	\$	4.918	\$	4.185	\$	(0.733)	\$	(0.733)

Notes to table:

(1) 2020 Formula O&M is the incremental funding with Net Inflation factor applied (2.290%).

(2) Cumulative Forecast/Actual variance is the same as the 2020 (first year of MRP) Forecast/Actual variance.

2

3

4

5

6

Offsetting the increase in Cybersecurity were lower expenditures of approximately \$0.906 million for Gas Control and CEPA participation. Contributing to the lower spend was the mid-year approval of the MRP, timing of the hiring of Gas Controllers, and timing of control room management improvements. The plan is to hire one net new Gas Controller per year and to coordinate the timing of the new hires with retirements of existing employees. FEI will proceed with implementing CEPA required control room management improvements in the coming months.

24.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that the spending reductions were not a result of FEI seeking savings.

#### 7 Response:

Confirmed. Please also refer to the response to BCOAPO IR1 9.1. 8

9 10			
11 12		24.1.1	Would FEI characterize the costs related to Data Analytics. Gas Control
13			and CEPA participation as being optional? Please explain.
14			
15	Response:		
16	No, FEI would	d not chai	acterize these costs as being optional.

17 As described in the MRP Application where this funding was approved, FEI considers these 18 activities as being necessary to meet FEI's commitment to delivering energy safely and reliably 19 and that its operations are focused on ensuring customer expectations are met by continuing to

20 focus on the efficient and effective completion of work.



1 2

3 4

5

6

Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 44

24.2 Why did the mid-year approval of the MRP affect the spending for Gas Control and CEPA participation? Would FEI not have undertaken these costs in the absence of the MRP? Please explain.

# 7

#### 8 **Response:**

9 The mid-year approval of the MRP affected the spending for Gas Control and CEPA participation 10 as well as other categories of System Operations, Integrity and Security Incremental Spending 11 because FEI believes it is prudent to obtain regulatory approval before proceeding with the 12 funding requests included in its MRP Application. Please also refer to the response to BCOAPO

13 IR1 9.1.

FEI cannot speculate on whether it would have undertaken these costs in the absence of the 14 15 approved incremental funding and the approved MRP. Factors that would have to be considered in FEI's decision to proceed with the expenditures would include the nature of the regulatory 16 17 framework and total overall funding available under an alternative rate plan.

- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22 24.3 Does FEI benefit from deferral of operational costs? Please explain and provide 23 quantification relating to the spending not undertaken in 2020 that was embedded 24 in Formula for 2020.
- 25

#### 26 Response:

27 FEI does not benefit overall from the deferral of O&M costs that are embedded in the formula. 28 Any savings in one year would be offset by costs in later years. The timing differences contribute 29 to incremental formula O&M savings or pressure which would be shared equally with customers 30 and the Company under the approved Earnings Sharing Mechanism.

For the total System Operations, Integrity, Security New/Incremental O&M funding of 31 32 approximately \$4.93 million that was included the 2020 formula O&M, the total underspending in 2020 was approximately (\$0.73) million, resulting in an increase of (\$0.54) million in after tax 33 34 earnings which under the approved Earnings Sharing Mechanism is shared 50/50, benefiting both 35 customers and the Company equally.



3

4 5

6

7

### 1 25. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 38 - 39

For the Data Analytics, the lower spending of approximately \$0.307 million was primarily due to one-time labour savings from the timing of new hires. In 2021, new hires are expected that will reduce the variance.

As discussed in the FEI Annual Review for 2020 and 2021 Delivery Rates application (pages 41 and 42), the funding for the different categories of new/incremental O&M approved for System Operations, Integrity and Security was developed based on the anticipated requirements over the term of the MRP, recognizing that priorities may change and that the expenditures may vary

from year to year depending upon factors such as the availability of resources (i.e., labour vacancies) and the timing of activities.

Over the term of the MRP, FEI anticipates that the total new/incremental spending required in the combined categories of System Operations, Integrity and Security will be relatively close to the cumulative approved formula amounts, and there will continue to be variations from year to year.

25.1 Why did FEI delay making new hires instead of undertaking it when first planned? Were the positions not necessary when originally planned? Please explain.

# 8 Response:

- 9 Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR1 9.1.
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 25.2 Does FEI expect that its overall spending for the Systems Operations, Integrity and
   14 Security categories will cumulatively equate to the cumulative formula amounts,
   15 accounting for inflation and the benefits of deferral? Please explain.
- 16

# 17 Response:

At this time, FEI does not know whether its overall spending for the System Operations, Integrity and Security categories over the term of the MRP will be cumulatively equal to the implied cumulative formula amounts adjusted for net inflation annually. However, as indicated in the Application, FEI anticipates that the total new/incremental spending required in the combined categories of System Operations, Integrity and Security will be relatively close to the cumulative approved formula amounts with variations from year to year.

Consistent with the approved formula O&M approach, FEI does not manage its total approved formula O&M expenditures on a line by line basis or using a per cost item approach (and specifically by classifications such as System Operations, Integrity and Security). Instead, FEI manages its formula O&M expenditures on an aggregate basis recognizing that expenditures may vary from year to year depending upon factors such as the availability of resources (i.e., labour vacancies), the timing of activities and the Company's business priorities.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 46

# 1 26. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 39

Table 6-4:	2022	Forecast	O&M	(\$	millions)
------------	------	----------	-----	-----	-----------

Line		Ар	proved	Pro	ojected	Fo	recast
No.	Description	:	2021	2021		2	2022
1	Pension/OPEB (O&M Portion)	\$	22.354	\$	22.354	\$	9.537
2	Insurance		9.908		10.430		11.474
3	Integrity Digs		4.800		5.900		5.700
4	BCUC Levies		7.290		7.290		7.408
5	Clean Growth Initiatives:						
6	Biomethane O&M		1.848		2.668		3.355
7	Renewable Gas Development		0.750		1.000		1.000
8	NGT O&M		1.813		1.919		2.057
9	Variable LNG Production Costs		8.081		7.281		7.553
10	Forecast O&M	\$	56.844	\$	58.842	\$	48.084

Each of the items that is forecast outside of the formula is discussed below. Variances in pension and OPEB expenses are captured in the Pension and OPEB Variance deferral account and amortized into rates over a three-year period, as approved by the BCUC in Order G-138-14. Variances in BCUC fees are captured in the BCUC Levies Variance deferral account and amortized into rates in the subsequent year. Variances in insurance, integrity digs, Clean Growth initiatives and exogenous factors are captured in the Flow-through deferral account.

2

- 2
- 3 4

26.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that the deferral account treatment is essentially flow-through and does not result in any incremental benefit to FEI.

5

# 6 Response:

7 Confirmed.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)	Submission Date: September 28, 2021
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 47

# 1 27. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 42 and page 43

Table 6-7:	Integrity Digs	Activities and	Expenditures
1 4510 0 1.	integrity Digo	Activities and	Expondituros

			Number of D	Digs per Year	
Line No.	Reason for Digs	2021 Approved	2021 Approved, corrected <sup>4</sup>	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
1	ILI Digs – New Tool(s): ILI digs attributed or projected due to an inspection with an ILI technology or ILI tool that has not been previously run in a given pipeline segment <sup>1</sup>	80	41	20	40
2	ILI Digs – New Practice(s): ILI digs attributed or projected due to changes to industry practices or standards (e.g., strain-based criteria for dent digs) requiring a corresponding change from FEI's past integrity dig practices <sup>2</sup>	40	40	28	20
3	ILI Digs – Established Tools and Practices: ILI digs identified through previously established technologies, tools, and practices <sup>3</sup>	25	64	74	80
4	<b>Non-ILI Digs:</b> Digs identified through above- ground cathodic protection and coating surveys	10	10	17	15
5	Total Integrity Digs	155	155	139	155
6	Total Expenditures (\$000s)	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$5,900	\$5,700
7	Cost per dig (\$000s)	\$31	\$31	\$42	\$37

2

 In 2020, FEI was granted a CPCN for its Inland Gas Upgrade project.<sup>25</sup> The 2022 Forecast includes FEI's estimate of integrity digs from first-time in-line inspections associated with this project.

3

- 4
- 5 6

27.1 Will any of the costs related to a CPCN project eventually be capitalized? Please explain and provide quantification for these costs.

# 7 **Response:**

8 None of the integrity dig costs included in Tables 6-4 and 6-7 of the Application will eventually be 9 capitalized. This includes the integrity digs costs related to the Inland Gas Upgrade (IGU) project, 10 as these digs are not part of the IGU project itself, but are digs that were enabled for the first time 11 because of the IGU project. All integrity digs costs, including the costs for IGU-driven digs, will 12 continue to be flowed through as part of the O&M outside of the MRP formula as approved by the

13 BCUC in the MRP Decision (page 74).



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

### Page 48

Submission Date:

September 28,

2021

### 1 28. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 41

### Table 6-6: Insurance Expense (\$ millions)

Line		App	roved	Pro	jected	Fo	recast	
No.	Description	2	021	1	2021	1	2022	Reference
1	Insurance Premiums	\$	9.908	\$	10.430	\$	11.474	Section 11, Schedule 20, Line 16
2	Total	\$	9.908	\$	10.430	\$	11.474	

The 2021 Projected insurance premium expense of \$10.430 million is \$0.522 million higher than 2021 Approved, as it incorporates FEI's actual July 2021 to June 2022 insurance renewals of \$11.194 million. The higher premiums experienced in 2021 are expected to continue into 2022. The forecast for 2022 insurance is \$11.474 million, an increase of \$1.044 million from 2021 Projected. The 2022 Forecast is calculated as the amount of the first six months of actual annual insurance premiums for January 2022 to June 2022 of \$5.597 million and applying a 5 percent increase for the remaining six months.<sup>23</sup>

2

3

4

- 28.1 How did FEI determine that a 5% increase was likely, as opposed to any other figure such as 4% or 6%?
- 5
- 6

28.1.1 What sources of information did FEI rely upon?

# 7 Response:

8 Similar to past years, FEI uses a 5 percent escalation unless there are indications that suggest 9 significant increases are forthcoming as a result of loss history for FEI or the utility industry as a 10 whole. To gauge the potential increase in premiums for July 2022, FEI obtained indicative pricing 11 information from insurance brokers. Based on market trending, a premium increase could be up 12 to 20 percent. However, as there is significant uncertainty regarding the determination of future premiums at this time, FEI incorporated only the 5 percent historical based increase. Only six 13 14 months of the 2022 forecast is affected by the 5 percent assumption; therefore, a 20 percent 15 assumption would increase the annual expense by approximately \$1.1 million, compared to a \$0.3 million increase for the 5 percent assumption. 16



# 1 29. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 43

FEI's forecasts related to ILI Digs – New Practices continue to be influenced by the required adoption of the strain-based criteria for dents in current industry practice and standards.

- 2
- 3
- 3

Please elaborate briefly on the strain-based criteria for dents in current industry practice and standards and how they are changing over time.

5

# 6 Response:

29.1

7 FEI has been performing strain-based dent digs since 2013 in accordance with industry practice

8 at the time, with strain-based criteria for dents being introduced into CSA Z662 in the 2015 edition.

9 As directed by CSA Z662 Clause 10.10.4.1, FEI has been applying ASME B31.8, Appendix R for 10 determining the strain in a dent. An error in the ASME publication was corrected in the 2018 11 edition of B31.8, impacting FEI's dent strain calculations. The change in the strain calculation 12 formula resulted in an increase in calculated strain value by 1.5 times on average, which 13 necessitated more digs than were identified previously. Furthermore, it is FEI's experience that 14 ILI tool capability to detect and size dent imperfections is improving, resulting in the ongoing 15 identification of more dents warranting integrity digs. As such, ILI technology improvements over 16 time and changes in strain-based criteria for dents are continuing to impact FEI's integrity dig 17 estimates.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 50

### 1 30. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 45

### 6.3.6 Clean Growth Initiative – Renewable Gas Development

Table 6-9: Renewable Gas Development O&M (\$ millions)

Line		Approved	Projected	Forecast	
No.	Description	2021	2021	2022	Reference
1	Renewable Gas Development	0.750	1.000	1.000	Section 11, Schedule 20, Line 21
2	Total	0.750	1.000	1.000	

In order to support the continued growth of the renewable gas portfolio, including the incorporation of other renewable gases such as hydrogen and synthetic methane, FEI requires resources within its Renewable Gas team to work on safety, codes and standards, and for feasibility work more generally. In May 2021, the Provincial government issued an amendment to the GGRR that forms the basis for FEI's acquisition of renewable gas. The amendment both expanded the amount of renewable gas that can be acquired from 5 to 15 percent and expanded the definition of renewable gas to include hydrogen, syngas and lignin, in addition to biomethane. In addition, the federal government has recently committed to increase carbon reduction targets from 30 percent to between 40 and 45 percent by 2030. The policy initiatives will expand the resources that are required to support renewable gas development. In addition to the work identified above, FEI is seeing the need to support Indigenous groups that are exploring the production of renewable gases in their communities.

As a result of this increased interest and support in advancing the development of renewable gas, FEI now expects to spend approximately \$1 million in 2021, which is approximately \$0.250 million higher than the 2021 Approved amount. Additional costs are for activities and feasibility work related to developing the supply of renewable gases and hydrogen into the program. Actual expenditures in 2021 may vary from that projected depending on the timing of the completion of work required and renewable gas development opportunities.

2022 Forecast O&M is approximately \$1 million, consistent with the 2021 Projected amount, and is related to requirements to continue work on safety, codes and standards, feasibility, and business development, recognizing that developments in the renewable gas industry may require the Company to respond accordingly and incur more costs than currently forecast.

3

2

- 4
- 5 6

7

30.1 Please provide further details regarding the additional activities being undertaken to develop the supply of renewable gases and hydrogen into the program, and explain why these required 33% more funding than anticipated for 2021.

# 8 Response:

9 The recent amendments to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Clean Energy) Regulation (GGRR)

10 enable renewable gas (RG) deployment at scale in British Columbia (BC) to help meet Provincial

11 decarbonization targets. Carrying out the prescribed undertakings for the acquisition of new types

12 of RG, including hydrogen, synthesis gas (syngas) and lignin, as set out in the GGRR will require

13 technological innovation, project development, informed regulatory proceedings and further

14 integration of RG supply into FEI's business planning and operations. FEI's current RG business

15 plan assumes a five-year outlook to develop the supply of these renewable gases into the program

16 and includes additional activities related to:



- 1 1. RG growth strategy and business development;
- 2 RG resource availability and production potential;
- 3 Gas system readiness, system-planning and deployment strategy;
- 4 Industry collaboration, research and development, feasibility work;
- 5. Pilot and demonstration project development; 5
- 6 6. Codes, Standards and Regulations; and
- 7 Stakeholder engagement to support market transition.
- The additional costs for RG development in 2021 are to support the resourcing and funding of 8
- 9 these activities. Detailed information regarding these additional activities is provided in the
- 10 following sections.

#### 11 1. RG Growth Strategy and Business Development:

12 FEI will develop new flexible supply options to efficiently deliver RG into the program. For 13 example, industrial gas consumers with feedstock availability to produce RG and the ability to 14 directly consume RG onsite, or on adjacent industrial site(s), could act as host-sites to displace 15 natural gas use. This notional delivery of RG by displacement would facilitate the production of syngas derived from biomass,<sup>4</sup> and lignin,<sup>5</sup> that could not otherwise be economically upgraded to 16 pipeline quality specifications and delivered to FEI's system. Key objectives of this activity include: 17

- 18 Develop a commercial framework, business model and supply contract structure;
- 19 Develop business management tools to improve RG supply volume forecasting; •
- 20 Develop a resourcing plan for the RG team to support greater volume of projects; and •
- 21 Stay informed of innovation in technology, policy and regulations. •

#### 22 2. RG Resource Availability and Production Potential:

23 While various supply potential analyses have been completed in BC, these existing estimates of 24 the RG supply potential need to be updated to inform RG growth strategy for increasing 25 production. FEI and the Province will update these estimates to reflect the latest technological 26 and policy developments shaping RG supply. This will include developing a range of supply 27 estimates and associated assumptions and factors required to develop a comprehensive 28 overview of the total RG potential and carbon intensity. Key objectives of this activity include:

Develop a BC-wide supply potential and carbon intensity for RG types and cost-curves, 29 • as well as similar analysis outside of BC. 30

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Synthesis gas as defined in section 7(1) of the GGRR.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Lignin as defined in section 8(a) of the GGRR.



- Use existing analyses and update them with new assumptions reflecting the changing market.
- Evaluate unique use-cases and end-uses such as evaluating the potential for required infrastructure in BC and using industrial consumers as host-sites with feedstock availability to produce RG and the ability to directly consume the fuel onsite, or on adjacent industrial site(s), to displace natural gas use.

# 7 3. Gas System Readiness, System Planning and Deployment Strategy

As FEI evaluates additional, and in some cases, larger scale RG project proposals, it will need to execute a system-wide technical feasibility study. This study would examine, for example, the blending of hydrogen into the gas supply including a technical readiness evaluation. Overlapping project requirements, and a limitation on system capacity, means the existing gas system should be optimized for at scale distributed gas production. Through this evaluation process, FEI would seek to identify areas where it can evolve its operational practices to allow more flexibility within its existing system, allowing for more RG injection. Key objectives of this activity include:

- Develop a system-wide hydrogen impact assessment to determine the acceptable
   hydrogen content throughout the gas system and confirm hydrogen blend levels in the gas
   system that would be suitable for safe long-term operation.
- Determine longer-term increases to the hydrogen blend limit that would be feasible with
   continuing research, regulatory amendments and codes and standard development,
   mitigation measures, and network upgrades.
- Develop a RG roadmap plan to address the technical uncertainties, develop approval pathways and support initial project implementation.
- Develop a deployment strategy to manage change and address safety, training and
   education for supply chain stakeholders and wider societal perceptions and
   considerations.

# 26 4. <u>Industry Collaboration, Research and Development, Feasibility Work, Sector Specific</u> 27 <u>Approaches:</u>

The development of hydrogen, syngas, and lignin as low-carbon fuels will require a number of innovative solutions. For example, making use of byproducts from existing processes, such as hydrogen vented as a byproduct from the production of sodium chlorate in BC, in order to capture and upgrade the waste hydrogen for use in industrial thermal processes. These are non-standard energy solutions that will require new ways to use low-carbon energy.

FEI is also in the process of testing how hydrogen interacts with pipeline materials, components and other equipment on its system using hydrogen blend concentrations in natural gas from 5 percent up to 20 percent by volume. FEI is also investigating the feasibility of hydrogen transport via repurposed high-pressure transmission pipelines with a long-term goal of repurposing



8

segments of existing natural gas networks for the delivery of hydrogen. Key objectives of this
 activity include:

- Advance the adoption of new RG production technologies, new ways and means to distribute RG and new end-use applications.
- Advance new energy metering, automatic fuel switching and energy use systems to
   ensure robustness and resiliency of energy supply is maintained.
  - Evaluate the technical and economic feasibility of large-scale projects for the centralized production and distribution of hydrogen, synthesis gas, and lignin.

Advance involvement with multiple international joint initiatives that aim to share scientific
 knowledge and technical guidance rapidly develop a RG ecosystem that can produce and
 distribute fuels such as hydrogen affordably as a clean energy supply. FEI aims to learn
 best practices from pioneering hydrogen projects that can be applied in BC.

# 13 5. <u>Pilot and Demonstration Project Development:</u>

FEI's understanding of RG production, distribution and end-use applications continues to expand.
As such, FEI has also begun developing pilot and pre-commercial demonstration projects that will
test RG production and the use of these low-carbon fuels in a closed system. Key objectives of
this activity include:

- Initiate hydrogen development and deployment through strategic demonstrations with
   university institutions and other development activities to scale supply and demand in key
   sectors.
- Demonstrate via a hydrogen injection/blending pilot project the viability and safety case
   for hydrogen as a fuel by addressing the technical uncertainties of introducing hydrogen
   into the existing gas network, and the potential impacts on end-users.
- Demonstrate a hydrogen micro-grid using hydrogen specific infrastructure to capture,
   clean, deliver and use byproduct hydrogen to decarbonize industry.
- Pilot technologies to produce hydrogen and solid carbon from certain hydrogen
   feedstocks.
- Pilot hydrogen separation to remove hydrogen from natural gas steam at sensitive receptors.
- Develop a first mover commercial scale industrial gas displacement project.

# 31 6. <u>Codes, Standards and Regulations</u>

FEI is engaging with the NRCan Codes and Standards working group task force to modify and develop safety and technical standards and set longer-term objectives to transition the regional

34 natural gas network to adopt RG. This includes hydrogen-ready infrastructure initiatives, including



7

8

9

the certification of new appliances and equipment and the design of hydrogen compatible naturalgas infrastructure. Key objectives of this activity include:

- Harmonize codes and standards across jurisdictions (provincial and international) to
   ensure that best practices are applied across the domestic and international hydrogen
   economy.
  - Work with the CSA Z662 Oil and gas pipeline systems code task force to review and update the requirements for gas pipelines. This will ensure that pipelines containing pure hydrogen, hydrogen blends or biomethane blended with natural gas are fully aligned with or incorporated into the CSA Z662 and CSA Z245 (steel pipe) standards.
- Develop a FEI corporate hydrogen standard that will govern all aspects of hydrogen in the natural gas supply and that will allow FEI, or third party suppliers, to blend hydrogen into the gas network.

# 13 7. <u>Stakeholder Engagement to Support Market Transition</u>

FEI's RG growth strategy is focused on supporting internal and external stakeholder engagement to expand RG supply opportunities. It is anticipated that changes to internal processes, education of internal and external stakeholders, and evolution of operating practices related to safety, operation, integrity, and codes and standards will support the adoption of new energy production technologies, energy delivery methods and energy end-use applications. Key objectives of this activity include:

- Communicate with internal and external stakeholder to educate about RG.
- Engage stakeholders regarding the various concepts of RG delivery through natural gas displacement.
- Develop the market transition framework to support RG at scale in BC including
   production, transportation and distribution of hydrogen by the utility, and use of hydrogen
   by customers for their energy needs.
- Support the integration and institutionalization of RG into the utility model.
- 27
- 28
- 29 30

31

32

30.2 Is the spending related to Clean Growth Initiative – Renewable Gas Development included in formulaic spending or otherwise previously approved? Please explain.

# 33 **Response:**

The Clean Growth Initiative – Renewable Gas Development O&M is not included in formulaic O&M spending or in other areas of FEI's revenue requirement. These types of O&M expenditures – i.e., Clean Growth Initiative expenditures – were approved to be treated as flow-through expenditures as part of the MRP Decision (page 119). For further reference, FEI provided an



explanation of these types of expenditures, which were described as O&M to support the Company's investments in a clean growth future, in the MRP application (page C-110). As noted in the MRP application, at the time of that application, the Clean Growth Initiative expenditure categories consisted of NGT stations and tankers, variable LNG production, and RNG (since expanded to include other forms of renewable gas); however, as FEI explained in the MRP application, other initiatives may be proposed to align with government policy.

FEI first sought and received approval of RG Development flow-through O&M as part of its 2020
and 2021 Annual Review, and due to the increasing amount of work and activities in this Clean
Growth area, as described in the response to CEC IR1 30.1, FEI expects it will be including annual
forecasts for RG Development O&M for the remainder of this MRP as part of its flow-through O&M
expenditures.

- 12
- 13
- 14
- 30.3 What factors should the Commission consider when it determines whether or not
   the increase in 2020 spending is appropriate?
- 17

# 18 **Response:**

19 FEI interprets the question as referring to the increase in 2021 spending, not 2020 spending.

20 The BCUC should review FEI's forecasts for RG O&M expenditures similarly to how the BCUC 21 would review any forecast flow-through expenditures, with the added consideration that the 22 renewable gas initiative is related to advancing prescribed undertakings for the acquisition of 23 renewable gases under the GGRR. FEI anticipates that the BCUC will consider whether the 24 expenditures are prudent and that the recovery of these expenditures through rates is just and 25 reasonable. The BCUC should also consider that pursuant to section 18 of the Clean Energy Act, 26 the commission must not in any way, directly or indirectly, prevent a public utility from carrying 27 out a prescribed undertaking.

28 As explained in the response to CEC IR1 30.1, the GGRR as amended is broad in scope in order 29 to enable renewable gas deployment at scale in BC and meet Provincial decarbonization targets. 30 As a result, increased O&M funding is required to support the many activities being undertaken 31 by FEI related to implementing the deployment of renewable gases. These activities are 32 described in detail in the response to CEC IR1 30.1. The objective of the expenditures is to 33 support the continued growth of the renewable gas portfolio which is necessary to respond to 34 government policy on climate change and advance prescribed undertakings for the acquisition of 35 renewable gases under the GGRR.

36 Considering the factors outlined above, FEI considers that the requested increase in funding for 37 renewable gas development is prudent and should be approved for recovery in rates. Any 38 variances between forecast/projected and actual expenditures will be recorded in the Flow-



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 56

through deferral account and will be recovered from or returned to customers in subsequent years
through amortization of the deferral account. Thus, in the event that the actual 2021 and 2022
amounts are different from the amounts presented in this Application, customers will be kept
whole.

- 5
- 6
- 7

9

8

30.4 What would be the process outcome if the Commission were to determine that the additional spending was not warranted?

10 11 **<u>Response:</u>** 

As indicated in the response to CEC IR1 30.3, FEI believes the spending of \$1 million for each of 2021 and 2022 is warranted.

14 Should the BCUC determine that some of the 2022 Forecast spending is not warranted, FEI would

15 potentially have to curtail some of its planned activities described in CEC IR1 30.1 in response to

the limitation on resources available. This will constrain the development of its renewable gas

17 portfolio and potentially limit FEI's ability to respond to government policy on climate change.

18 With regard to the 2021 Projected O&M expenditures, FEI's planned spending on the activities described in CEC IR1 30.1 are well underway, and a decision on this Application is not expected 19 20 until December 2021. Therefore, practically speaking, FEI would not have the opportunity to 21 adjust its activities and spending. From a rate-setting standpoint, the impact of the 2021 Projected 22 O&M being higher than what was forecast in the 2020 and 2021 Annual Review (i.e., a variance 23 of \$0.250 million) is that the variance is captured in the Flow-through deferral account and forms 24 part of the 2022 amortization expense. FEI's actual 2021 spending will be further trued up in the 25 2023 annual review, as the variance between 2021 Projected and 2021 Actual flow-through 26 expenses will be captured in the Flow-through deferral account and returned to or recovered from 27 customers through amortization of the deferral account in 2023 delivery rates.

28 If the BCUC were to deny a portion of FEI's 2022 Forecast or 2021 Projected RG O&M expenses,

29 FEI would review the implications and basis of the decision and decide on a course of action.

30 However, FEI is unable to speculate further on this in the absence of a specific determination.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### Page 57

### 1 31. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 46

### 6.3.8 Clean Growth Initiative - Variable LNG Production Costs

For the MRP, LNG O&M costs are allocated between formula and forecast (flow-through) O&M based on whether they are fixed or variable costs. Fixed costs represent the fixed costs to operate the LNG plant, regardless of its use (for peak shaving storage, or LNG production for sales). The remaining portion of total LNG O&M costs is treated as flow-through outside of formula O&M. These costs represent the variable costs for the production of LNG (liquefaction of natural gas, the dispensing of LNG, the handling and loading of tankers with LNG, etc.) where the costs fluctuate and are dependent on sales volumes.

2

A table breaking out the various components of the Variable LNG Production Costs is included below.

	Approved	Projected	Forecast
Description	2021	2021	2022
Tilbury Plant:			
Labour	1.650	1.350	1.706
Materials	0.540	0.740	0.765
Contractor	1.131	1.131	0.612
Power	3.813	3.113	3.492
Fees and Employee Expenses	0.308	0.308	0.319
Sub-total	7.443	6.643	6.893
Mt. Hayes Plant			
Labour	0.315	0.315	0.325
Materials	0.026	0.026	0.027
Contractor	0.056	0.056	0.057
Power	0.243	0.243	0.251
Fees and Employee Expenses	0.000	0.000	0.000
Sub-total	0.639	0.639	0.660
Total O&M	8.081	7.281	7.553

### Table 6-11: Variable LNG Production O&M (\$ millions)

3

- 4 5
- 31.1 Please confirm, or otherwise explain, that the flow-through treatment of variable costs will result in the difference between the 2021 Approved and the 2021 Projected being returned to ratepayers.
- 6 7
- 31.1.1 When will this return be realized?

# 8 Response:

9 For the purposes of setting 2022 delivery rates, FEI confirms that the difference between 2021 10 Approved and 2021 Projected Variable LNG Production O&M will be recorded in the Flow-through 11 deferral account and this difference is included as part of 2022 amortization expense through 12 amortization of the 2021 Projected ending Flow-through deferral account balance. Accordingly, 13 the variance between the 2021 Projected and 2021 Approved amount is returned to customers 14 as part of the 2022 revenue requirements and delivery rates.



 FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)
 Submission Date:

 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)
 September 28, 2021

 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)
 Page 58

1 FEI notes that a further true-up will occur when setting 2023 delivery rates, as the difference

2 between the 2021 Projected and 2021 Actual Variable LNG Production O&M will be recorded in

3 the Flow-through deferral account (once actual amounts are known), and this difference will be

4 included in 2023 amortization expense.

5 Please refer to Section 12.4.2.2 of the Application for further details on the Flow-through deferral

6 account mechanism and calculation.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

#### 1 32. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, page 49 and page 50

#### 7.2 **R**EGULAR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

As part of the MRP Decision and Order G-165-20, FEI received the following approvals for capital expenditures:

- Approval of FEI's forecasts submitted for regular sustainment and other capital expenditures for the years 2020 through 2022;
- Approval of growth capital to be set annually on a formula basis; and
- Approval of a number of items to be forecast outside the formula on an annual basis.

Line Approved Projected Forecast No. Description 2021 2021 2022 Reference Formula Growth Capex 64.844 64.844 87.501 Table 7-2, Line 9 Forecast Sustainment & Other Capex 162.860 162,860 163.580 Section 11, Schedule 4, Lines 16 + 17 Flow through Capex 27.012 26.553 50.619 Section 11, Schedule 4, Sum of Lines 13 through 15 3 254.716 254.257 **Total Gross Regular Capex** 301.700 Less: Formula CIAC (2.250) (2.250) (1.948) Section 11, Schedule 9, Line 2 Less: Forecast CIAC (3.755) (3.755)(3.901)Section 11, Schedule 9, Line 3 Net Regular Capex 248.711 248.252 295.851 7

#### Table 7-1: Regular Capital Expenditures (\$ millions)

3

4

5

6

2

Please provide a brief review of the types of costs that are included in Formula 32.1 Growth capital.

#### 7 **Response:**

1

2

6

8 Formula Growth Capital consists of capital expenditures related to New Customer Mains, New

9 Customer Services, New Customer Meters and System Improvements (under Distribution Plant).

- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 32.2 Please confirm there are none of the regular capital expenditures are assessed 14 outside of this proceeding (i.e. CPCN), nor essentially pre-approved by way of prior 15 approval of sustainment capital, through special directions, through formula or 16 other means, or otherwise identify and quantify any regular capital expenditures 17 that are neither Flow Through.
- 18

#### 19 Response:

20 FEI's regular capital expenditures for 2022, as shown in Table 7-1 of the Application, include the 21 following categories of expenditures, some of which have been assessed outside the proceeding as noted below: 22

23 Formula growth capital (Section 7.2.1 of the Application): The Base Growth Capital • 24 and formula mechanism were approved as part of the MRP Decision. The forecast gross



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 60

customer additions and Net Inflation Factor are reviewed as part of the annual review
 process.

- Approved sustainment and other capital (Section 7.2.2 of the Application): The 2020
   through 2022 regular sustainment and other capital forecasts were approved as part of
   the MRP Decision.
- 6 Flow-through capital expenditures (Section 7.2.3.1 of the Application): The 7 pension/OPEB capital expenditures are reviewed as part of the annual review process, 8 while Biomethane and NGT Asset expenditures are generally subject to review through 9 separate individual applications to the BCUC where the BCUC confirms that they are 10 prescribed undertakings or stations approved under FEI's General Terms and Conditions 11 (i.e., FEI's applications for acceptance of biomethane purchase agreements and approval 12 of CNG/LNG station service rates). There is no separate application process for LNG 13 tankers or truck load-out facilities.
- 14

FEI's regular capital expenditures do <u>not</u> include CPCNs and Special Projects (e.g. projects
approved by Order in Council), as discussed in Section 7.2.3.2 of the Application.

17 The above described categories represent all of FEI's 2022 capital expenditures and have been 18 reported on as part of this Application in Section 7.2. FEI's proposed delivery rate increase 19 applied for in this Application includes the cost of service impacts of all regular capital 20 expenditures and the impacts of rate base additions from CPCNs and major projects. There are 21 no capital expenditures forecast for 2022 excluded from this Application or the financial schedules 22 provided in Section 11. FEI also notes that while it currently has a number of ongoing CPCN 23 applications (i.e., OCU, TLSE, CTS TIMC and AMI), FEI does not include the potential rate 24 impacts of CPCN projects which have not yet received BCUC approval in its delivery rate change 25 calculations.



 FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)
 Submission Date:

 Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)
 September 28, 2021

 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)
 Page 61

# 1 33. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 51 and page 98

# 7.2.2 Forecast Capital Expenditures

The level of forecast capital expenditures approved for 2022 by the MRP Decision and Order G-165-20 is shown in Table 7-3 below.

Table 7-3:	Forecast	Capital	Expenditures	(\$	millions)	1
------------	----------	---------	--------------	-----	-----------	---

Line No.	Description			App 2	oroved	Projected 2021	Forecas 2022	Reference
1	Sustainment Capital				112.944	112.944	117.10	06 Section 11, Schedule 4, Line 16
2	Other Capital				49.916	49.916	6 46.4	74 Section 11, Schedule 4, Line 17
3	Total				162.860	162.860	163.5	Line 1 + Line 2
	FORTISBC ENERGY INC.		FEL	Annual Revie	ew for 202	2 Rates - Ju	ly 30, 2021	Section 11
	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2022 (\$000s)							Schedule 4
Line			Growth	Other	For	ecast	Total	
No.	Particulars		CapEx	CapEx	Ca	pEx	CapEx	Cross Reference
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	Inflation Indexed Capital Growth 2021 Unit Cost Growth Capital 2022 Net Inflation Factor 2022 Unit Cost Growth Capital 2022 Gross Customer Additions 2022 Inflation Indexed Growth Capital 2020 Growth Capital Customer True-Up 2022 System Extension Fund 2022 Growth CalAC 2022 Inflation Indexed Gross Growth Capital Capital Tracked Outside of Formula Pension & OPEB (Growth Capital Portion) Biomethane Assets NGT Assets Sustainment Capital Other Capital Sub-total	\$  \$  \$	3,912 3,324% 4,042 20,000 80,840		\$	\$ 1,693 40,255 8,671 17,106 46,474 214,199	80,840 3,713 1,000 <u>1,948</u> 87,501 214,199	Schedule 3, Line 9, Column 5
20	Total Capital Expenditures Before CIAC					\$	301,700	

3

4

2

- 33.1 Please breakdown the costs that are included in Sustainment Capital and Other Capital.
- 5 6

# 7 Response:

A breakdown of the costs included in sustainment and other capital is provided below. The 2022
forecast for sustainment and other capital was approved as part of the MRP Decision and Order
G-165-20<sup>6</sup>. The below tables are consistent with the 2022 forecasts approved in the MRP
Decision. As directed in the MRP Decision, FEI will file an updated forecast of sustainment and
other capital for 2023 and 2024 in the 2023 Annual Review.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> MRP Decision, p. 125, Tables 41 and 42 (total before CIAC).



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

### Sustainment Capital (\$ millions)

	Forecast 2022
Customer Measurement	31.781
Transmission System Reliability & Integrity	41.021
Distribution System Reliability	19.224
Distribution System Integrity	25.080
Total Sustainment Capital	117.106

# Other Capital (\$ millions)

	Forecast 2022
Equipment	12.288
Facilities	5.760
Information Systems	28.426
Total Other Capital	46.474

1

2 3



### 1 34. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 52 and 53

FEI's applications for each biomethane project are filed and approved individually by the BCUC; therefore, the capital estimates provided here are not being requested for approval as part of the annual review process, but are provided to include the current estimates for biomethane capital expenditures in customer rates.

The 2021 Projected capital expenditures are less than 2021 Approved by \$12.106 million. The variance between 2021 Projected and Approved is primarily due to a delay in spending on the

City of Vancouver project. FEI has not been able to finalize a design-build contract with an appropriate party to execute the City of Vancouver landfill project. The selection process has been longer than expected and there is now a need to adjust the project execution approach which will delay the spending. FEI forecasts \$24.000 million of capital expenditures in 2022 with the work to be completed in 2023, resulting in an expected in-service date of early 2024.

# 5 34.1 When was FEI's original expected in-service date for the City of Vancouver 6 project?

7

4

2

3

# 8 Response:

- 9 FEI's originally expected in-service date for the City of Vancouver landfill project was Q1 of 2021.
- 10 As further explained in the response to CEC IR1 34.2, FEI is currently forecasting that the City of
- 11 Vancouver landfill project will be in-service Q4 of 2023.
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 34.2 Does FEI have confidence that it will be able to finalize a design-build contract in
  the near future? Please explain why or why not.
- 17

# 18 Response:

As explained in the response to BCUC IR1 11.1, a design-build contract could not be finalized with an appropriate party and a design-bid-build project delivery method has now been selected

21 as the preferred alternative.

22 FEI has already installed a portion of pipeline to connect to the upgrader, commenced site 23 preparation, submitted permit applications, started detailed design with an engineering firm, and 24 commenced procurement for the biogas upgrading equipment. FEI is targeting to have the 25 engineering design fully completed by mid-2022 and expects to procure major equipment 26 between Q4 of 2021 and Q1 of 2022 for delivery to site before the end of 2022. FEI also expects 27 to pre-qualify contractors, issue a competitive Request For Proposals to procure the construction 28 of the project in 2022 and award the contract for construction in that same year with a target to 29 complete construction in 2023. FEI's current project schedule forecasts that the City of Vancouver 30 landfill project will be in-service by Q4 of 2023.



1 2			
3			
4		34.2.1	If not, does FEI have confidence in the early 2024 expected in-service
5			date, or is this mainly a best estimate? Please explain.
6			
7	<u>Response:</u>		
8	Please refer t	the resp	conse to CEC IR1 34.2.
9			
10			
11			
12		34.2.2	How will the delay in expected in-service date impact expected
13			expenditures? Please explain and quantify where possible.
14			
15	Response:		
16	Please refer t	the resp	ponse to BCUC IR1 11.2.
17			



# 35. Reference: Exhibit B-2, pages 53 through 56

# 7.2.3.2 CPCN and Special Project Capital Expenditures

Also forecast outside of the formula are any capital expenditures related to approved CPCNs, and other projects that are proceeding as a result of an Order in Council (OIC). In 2022, FEI is forecasting capital expenditures related to the Tilbury 1A Expansion project, the LMIPSU project, the IGU project and the PGR project. Each project is discussed below.

2 3

4

5

1

35.1 Please identify any projects currently underway for which the costs are expected to exceed the approved amounts by more than 10%.

# 6 <u>Response:</u>

7 When the BCUC grants a CPCN, it determines that the project is in the public interest and does

8 not specifically approve a cost estimate. For all of the listed CPCNs, FEI is required to submit 9 regular progress reports and material change reports if there is a material change to the project,

10 including schedule and costs. As such, the BCUC is informed with updated project budget

11 information regularly.

12 The only project which has exceeded (or is currently expected to exceed) the capital cost forecast

13 presented in the CPCN application by more than 10 percent is the LMIPSU project. The forecast

14 total capital cost included in the CPCN application was \$262.184 million. The current forecast for

15 the LMIPSU project is \$446.142 million, including AFUDC and abandonment/demolition costs, as

16 discussed in Section 7.2.3.2 of the Application. A Material Change Report was filed with the

BCUC in December 2017 which provided the revised control budget. This revised control budget
 was \$513.588 million and, as previously stated, FEI is expecting the final project cost to be lower

19 than the revised control budget by approximately \$67.446 million or 13 percent.



Page 66

# 1 36. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 64 and page 65

### a) Bill payment deferrals provided to residential and small commercial customers

Information Request (IR) No. 1

The bill payment deferral program was offered to residential and small commercial customers affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall, the bill payment deferral program has been successful, providing easy to access bill payment support to those customers that need it most during the pandemic with minimal administrative burden. FEI has experienced high collection rates in regards to this program and is therefore expecting to recover approximately 90 percent of the outstanding balances through the regular monthly instalments. FEI will no longer be accepting new applications effective June 1, 2021.

2

Based on the results of a small pilot customer contact approach (which is described further below) and current repayment trends, FEI expects approximately 90 percent of the required repayments under the deferral arrangement to be collected, resulting in approximately 10 percent of the amounts being considered unrecoverable. This results in \$0.280 million of customer accounts being deemed unrecoverable and therefore reclassed within the COVID-19 Customer Recovery Fund Deferral Account to unrecoverable revenue additions in section (c).

3 4 5

36.1 Why will FEI no longer be accepting new applications as of June 1, 2021?

# 6 **Response:**

FEI is no longer accepting new applications to the program effective June 1, 2021 because
customers are better supported through individual and custom payment arrangements at this
time. FEI came to this determination in consideration of the length of time that has passed since
the commencement of the program, the low volume of new applications received each month
following the initial program launch, and finally, the imminent end of the repayment period for bill
payment deferrals.<sup>7</sup>

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 36.2 Please breakdown the total value of deferrals by rate class.
- 17

### 18 **Response:**

Please refer to the restated version of Table 7-9 from the Application below for a breakdown ofthe total value of bill payment deferrals by rate class.

21 Please note that FEI has restated Table 7-9 to reflect bill deferral additions by rate class as well

as made a minor adjustment to reflect the small number of bill deferral additions incurred in 2021,

23 which had previously been reflected in the 2020 amount.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Depending on the billing cycle for each customer, the end of the formal repayment program will occur in September or October 2021 regardless of when the customer entered the formal bill deferral program.



Submission Date: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) September 28, Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) 2021 Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Page 67 Information Request (IR) No. 1

### Restated Table 7-9: Bill Payment Deferral Amounts by Rate Class (\$ millions)<sup>8</sup>

<b>Residential Customers</b>	2020 Actual	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
Opening Balance	-	1.516	0.253
Additions	2.110	0.026	-
Repayments	(0.594)	(1.289)	-
Transfers	-	-	(0.253)
Ending Balance	1.516	0.253	-
Commercial Customers	2020 Actual	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
Opening Balance	-	0.451	0.027
Additions	0.693	0.008	-
Repayments	(0.242)	(0.432)	-
Transfers	-	-	(0.027)
Ending Balance	0.451	0.027	-

- 2
- 3

4

5

Please breakdown the uncollectible values by rate class. 36.3

# 6

#### 7 Response:

8 Please refer to the re-stated version of Table 7-9 provided in the response to CEC IR1 36.2 which 9 provides a rate class breakdown of all components of the bill deferral program additions,

10 repayments and unrecoverable amounts (which are noted as transfers).

11 As shown in the restated table, the 2022 forecast transfer amounts of \$253 thousand for 12 Residential and \$27 thousand for Commercial reflect the forecast amounts of unrecoverable 13 revenue pertaining to the bill deferral program.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Rounding difference to closing balance of 0.001 in 2020 as compared to Table 7-9 in the Application.



#### 1 37. **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, page 66

#### Table 7-11: Unrecoverable Revenue Amounts (\$ millions)

	2020 Actual	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
Opening Balance	-	0.064	0.502
Transfers	-	-	0.280
Additions <sup>35</sup>	0.088	0.600	1.700
Тах	(0.024)	(0.162)	(0.535)
Ending Balance	0.064	0.502	1.947

2

37.1 Please breakdown the Unrecoverable Revenue by rate class.

3 4

5 **Response:** 

6 Please refer to the tables below for a breakdown of the unrecoverable revenue by rate class per 7 year.

<b>Residential Customers</b>	2020 Actual	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
Opening Balance	-	0.061	0.455
Transfers	-		0.253
Additions	0.084	0.540	1.530
Тах	(0.023)	(0.146)	(0.482)
Ending Balance	0.061	0.455	1.756
Commercial Customers	2020 Actual	2021 Projected	2022 Forecast
Opening Balance	-	0.003	0.047
Opening Balance Transfers	-	0.003	0.047 0.027
Opening Balance Transfers Additions	0.004	0.003	0.047 0.027 0.170
Opening Balance Transfers Additions Tax	- - 0.004 (0.001)	0.003 - 0.060 (0.016)	0.047 0.027 0.170 (0.053)

8



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 69

# 1 38. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 73

Table 8-1:	Short Term	Interest Rate	Forecast

FE	I Short Term Interest Rate	Approved 2021	Projected 2021	Forecast 2022
3-M	onth T-Bill Rate <sup>1</sup>	0.45%	0.13%	0.47%
Spre	ad to CDOR	0.44%	0.39%	0.39%
CDC	DR Rate	0.89%	0.52%	0.86%
Spre	ad to CP	-0.22%	-0.32%	-0.32%
CPI	Dealer Commission	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%
STI	nterest Rate on Credit Facilities	0.77%	0.30%	0.64%
Fixe	d Financing Fees <sup>2</sup>			
5	Standby fee on Undrawn Credit <sup>3</sup>	0.86%	0.90%	1.12%
F	Renewal Fee on Undrawn Credit	0.33%	0.32%	0.40%
(	Other Financing Fees <sup>4</sup>	0.23%	0.12%	0.15%
STI	nterest Rate on Fixed Financing Fee	1.42%	1.34%	1.67%
FEI	Short Term Rate	2.19%	1.64%	2.31%

### 6 Response:

The 2021 projected short-term interest rate is lower as compared to the approved rate primarily
due to an update of the forecast 3-month T-bill rate. Please refer to the responses to BCOAPO
IR1 17.1 and 17.2 for further explanation of the T-bill rate change.

- 10

2

3

4 5

11

12 13

14

15

38.2 What economic factors does FEI believe are at work that cause FEI to expect the short- term interest rate will increase to 2.31% in F2022? Please explain.

# 16 **Response:**

17 The increase in the short-term interest rate in the 2022 forecast is due to an increase in the 18 forecast rates of the underlying benchmark (3-month T-Bill Rate) provided by the five major 19 chartered Canadian banks, who will typically incorporate a number of assumptions into their 20 forecasts including expectations around Bank of Canada rate setting, available liquidity and other 21 economic factors.

In addition, the relative impact of fixed fees is expected to be slightly higher due to a lower forecastshort-term debt average balance in 2022.

24



3

4

38.3 Please provide the last 5 years history of forecasting interest rates for the Annual Review and the actual interest rates experienced after the fact.

#### 5 Response:

6 The 2016 to 2020 Approved short-term interest rates from their respective FEI Annual Review 7 filings and the 2016 to 2020 Actual short-term interest rates from their respective FEI BCUC

8 Annual Reports are provided in the table below. Under FEI's approved 2020-2024 MRP, any 9 variances from interest rates used to set delivery rates will be flowed through to customers.

		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
	Approved	1.25%	1.40%	2.10%	3.10%	1.65%
10	Actual	1.70%	2.07%	2.82%	3.19%	1.78%





Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 71

### 1 **39.** Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 75

# 9.2 PROPERTY TAXES

Property taxes for 2022 of \$73.397 million incorporate Company forecasts of assessed values of taxable assets, mill rates and taxes from revenues earned from gas consumed within municipalities. A breakdown of property taxes by asset type is provided in Table 9-1 below.

		Ар	Approved		Projected		Forecast	
Line No.	Description	2	2021		2021		2022	
1	Distribution Assets	\$	25.473	\$	27.272	\$	28.360	
2	Transmission Assets		21.012		18.847		19.209	
3	Gas Storage Assets		8.185		6.949		7.118	
4	Manufactured Gas Assets		0.037		0.035		0.036	
5	General Assets		4.478		4.869		5.128	
6	In-Lieu		12.423		12.693		13.368	
7	OGC Fees		0.286		0.285		0.285	
8	Total Property Taxes	\$	71.894	\$	70.950	\$	73.504	
9	Less: Property Tax Transferred to BVA		(0.083)		(0.083)		(0.107)	
10	Net Property Tax	\$	71.811	\$	70.867	\$	73.397	
11								
12	Forecast Change from 2021 Approved						2.2%	
13	Forecast Change from 2021 Projected						3.6%	

Table 9-1: Property Tax Forecasts (\$ millions)

As shown in the above table, in 2022 property taxes are forecast to increase by 2.2 percent from 2021 Approved and increase by 3.6 percent compared to 2021 Projected. The increase in the 2022 Forecast compared to 2021 Projected is due to construction activities, market value increases, changes in tax policies of local taxing authorities and increased in-lieu taxes. The most significant forecast drivers of the changes are as follows:

2 3

39.1 What sources of information does FEI rely upon in identifying expected changes in property taxes?

4 5

# 6 **Response:**

When actual changes have been announced or approved by the various taxing authorities, FEI
 uses those in determining expected changes in property taxes.

9 When actual changes are not known, FEI relies on historical data, discussions with BC 10 Assessment, media information related to real estate markets, or any other information that may

11 be relevant to estimate changes.

- 12 Please refer to the responses to BCOAPO IR1 18.1 and 19.1 for further information.
- 13

14

15


1 2

3

- 39.2 When was the last time that FEI challenged the property taxes being assessed to it? Please provide the results of the most recent contesting.
- 4 <u>Response:</u>

5 FEI reviews property assessments annually, and attempts to resolve assessment issues with BC

6 Assessment prior to the close of the assessment roll to avoid the necessity and costs of filing

7 appeals. During the COVID-19 pandemic, changes to property taxes have been somewhat muted

- 8 with relatively few appeals required.
- 9 The most significant recent challenge that FEI made to a property tax assessment resulted when
- 10 BC Assessment assigned an incorrect code to a portion of the transmission pipeline in the City of
- 11 Richmond. The incorrect code was initially detected in 2020 after FEI received the tax notice, and
- 12 the appeal deadline had passed. However, after discussions with BC Assessment, they agreed
- to issue a supplementary assessment notice in July 2020. In July 2021, a cheque for \$166,022
- 14 was received from the City of Richmond as a refund for overpaid taxes.



Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 73

## 1 40. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 86

The EAC is made up of a variety of FortisBC stakeholders to provide insight and feedback on the Companies' innovative initiatives on a periodic basis. The EAC includes the following stakeholders:

- BCOAPO;
- MoveUP;
- BCSEA;
- BC Ministry of Energy, Mines and Low-Carbon Innovation;
- Foresight Cleantech Accelerator Centre;
- BC Bioenergy Network
- University of British Columbia
- University of Victoria; and
- City of Kamloops.

The EAC has met three times. Two of the meetings were to review and advise on the two expenditure portfolios prior to approval by the ESC.

At the first meeting, the purpose and the five key criteria for evaluating innovative proposals were reviewed. The five key criteria were established during the MRP application regulatory process, and are:

- 1. Amount of co-funding secured (from applicant and third parties);
- 2. Estimated CO2e reduction in British Columbia;
- 3. Estimated non-CO2e emission reduction (NOx, SOx) in British Columbia;
- 4. Estimation of energy cost reductions for customers; and
- 5. Relevant experience of the applicant project team.

At both portfolio review meetings, the proposals that were recommended and rejected by the FEI Innovation Working Group were presented to the EAC. The EAC asked a number of questions regarding the proposals and the overall portfolio mix, and in the end agreed with the recommendations and rejections put forward by FEI.

In addition to the two portfolio review meetings, FEI representatives also presented to the EAC a summary of the key findings of a FortisBC-commissioned report that explores different low carbon pathways. The *Pathways for British Columbia to Achieve Its GHG Reduction Goals* assesses the implications of two alternative energy pathways to a low carbon future for BC and recommends a diversified pathway which utilizes and builds on both the electricity and gas infrastructure in the Province.

- 5 40.1 Is the CEC on the EAC? Please explain.
- 6

4

- 7 <u>Response:</u>
- 8 FEI confirms that the CEC is not currently on the EAC.

2



Submission Date:

September 28,

- 1 The CEC was originally invited to participate in the EAC in July 2020 (as were other interveners);
- 2 however, the CEC did not confirm participation at that time. FEI re-sent the email invitation to the
- 3 CEC in October 2020 in response to a follow-up question regarding participation on the EAC. The
- 4 CEC confirmed its interest and indicated that it would nominate a CEC designate; however, a
- 5 nomination was not received.

6 FEI has again reached out to the CEC with an invitation and welcomes its participation on the7 EAC.



FORTIS BC

Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

## 1 41. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 132 and page 133

#### 12.2.1.3.2 O&M COST REDUCTIONS OFFSET INCREASED COSTS

The cost reductions that FEI achieved consist primarily of lower employee expenses, in part as a response to the travel restrictions, including in and out of province travel, and the effect that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on social interactions. Employee expenses include course fees, travel, meals and accommodation, company function expenses, and employee hiring and relocation expenses.

As at December 2020, the reduced employee expenses identified and reprioritized by departments for addressing COVID-19 pandemic costs were estimated at approximately \$3.7 million. In addition to reduced employee expenses, there was an estimated \$0.2 million reduction in employee health benefits (dental, employee health spending, etc.) used by employees, bringing the total cost reductions to approximately \$3.9 million in 2020.

## 12.2.1.4 2021 COVID-19 Pandemic Impact

Based on the current outlook regarding the COVID-19 pandemic in BC, FEI expects the impact on the Company's operating costs to decline in the coming months and eventually end. FEI's current plans are to resume normal operations coinciding with the Province achieving Step 4 of the Province of BC Four Step Restart Plan, currently planned for September 7, 2021. Step 4 includes the lifting of restrictions with normal social contact allowed and workplaces fully reopened.

- 4
  41.1 The pandemic has resulted in considerable use of online video communications
  instead of in person face-to-face communications. Please explain if FEI expects
  to continue to use such resources or if it intends to revert to in-person meetings.
  - 41.1.1 If FEI expects to continue to use online communications in place of various face-to-face meetings, can FEI expect to continue to reduce costs permanently? Please explain.
- 1041.1.1.1 If FEI expects to be able to reduce costs permanently, please11provide approximate quantification of any savings FEI expects12to achieve in the long term.

# 14 Response:

FEI confirms that since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in the first quarter of 2020 and the beginning of social and physical restrictions on interactions, employees, particularly its officebased staff, have increased their use of online video communications as an alternative to in person face-to-communications, both internally with other employees and externally with some stakeholders and other parties including vendors.

Post COVID-19 pandemic, with the move to Step 4 and the lifting of restrictions with normal social contact allowed and workplaces fully reopened, FEI anticipates online video communications will continue to be used in addition to in person face-to-face communications and other forms of communication (i.e., telephone, email, etc). However, FEI is uncertain whether cost reductions that may be linked to the use of online video communications would continue permanently after

2

7

8

9



1 the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, while online video communication is expected to be used 2 permanently in a post-COVID-19 pandemic world, FEI is uncertain as to how often and in which 3 situations use of these communication tools will make business sense. Additionally, there may be cost increases related to the resumption of in person face-to-face meetings that may offset 4 5 any cost reductions, such as for the costs of travel, meals and accommodations, as businesses 6 such as restaurants, hotels and airlines potentially pass on their higher costs of operating in a 7 post-pandemic world. Another consideration is that determining permanent cost reductions may 8 be difficult in a post pandemic environment as there may be other factors that could cause the 9 related costs (i.e., employee expenses) to vary from period to period. For example, as a result of 10 the COVID-19 pandemic, the Company deferred its Employee Milestone events in both 2020 and 11 2021 with the plan to catch up and hold the in person employee recognition events in 2022. 12 essentially shifting employee expenses from one year to another.

Lastly, if there are permanent cost reductions due to continued use of online video communications post the COVID-19 pandemic, it is because of FortisBC's efforts to permanently integrate use of this form of communication in its business, with the related O&M formula cost reductions, like any other cost reductions achieved during the MRP, shared between customers and the Company.



# 1 42. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 153 and page 153

While the 2021 year-to-date injury rate is trending above previous years, the majority of the injuries experienced in 2021 are low severity in nature (ergonomic related strains and sprains), and mitigation measures have been taken to address the causes of these injuries. Aspiring to create a safe workplace, where all employees go home healthy and safe each day, continues to be the main organizational goal. This includes reducing the number of relatively low consequence accidents, like those that feature in the AIFR metric, in a proportionate and effective manner. However, the number of low consequence accidents are not in themselves predictors of the likelihood that high severity injuries will be experienced. For this reason, FEI continues to dedicate proportionate focus on high risk activities, ensuring that finite resources are applied cost effectively to build sufficient safety capacity and resilience in the Company's systems and that robust critical controls have been identified, implemented and sustained to avoid serious life altering injuries or fatalities.

Description	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	June 2021 YTD
Annual Results	1.73	2.52	2.13	1.36	1.74	1.82	1.43	2.87
Three year rolling average	2.22	2.42	2.13	2.00	1.74	1.64	1.66	1.78
Benchmark	2.08							
Threshold	2.95							

## Table 13-4: Historical All Injury Frequency Rate Results

3

2

4 5

6

42.1 FEI states that it has finite resources. Please describe and quantify the finite resources applied, and who determines the level of resources.

# 7 <u>Response:</u>

8 FEI clarifies that the reference to the phrase "finite resources" was not meant to convey a limit on 9 people or budget, nor was it meant to convey an issue with the amount of resources available to 10 support safety programs and initiatives. Instead, it reflects that safety programs require prioritized 11 areas of focus that align with trends identified by both leading and lagging indicators in order to 12 be successful. In FEI's case, this involves not only a focus on reducing lower consequence 13 incidents such as those reflected in the AIFR for 2021, but also on reducing the potential for higher 14 consequence incidents through the use of training, audits, hazard identification and risk 15 assessment and other types of leading indicator reporting, proactive safety activities and 16 monitoring. Each year, the required amount of resources are allocated to departments based on 17 these prioritized areas of focus, and throughout the year, adjustments can be made for additional 18 support if required.

19



1 2

3

4

42.2 Please confirm or otherwise explain that FEI has significant discretion in the resources it applies to reducing injuries.

# 5 **Response:**

6 FEI confirms that it has the discretion to apply resources as required to support a successful

7 safety management system and safety culture and believes the current level of resources is
 8 sufficient.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)<br/>Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application)Submission Date:<br/>September 28,<br/>2021Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)<br/>Information Request (IR) No. 1Page 79

# 1 43. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 150 and pages 158 and 159

Telephone Service Factor (Non- Emergency)	Percent of non-emergency calls answered within 30 seconds or less	>= 70%	68%	70%	66%
--	---	--------	-----	-----	-----

2

3

The 2020 result was 70 percent which meets the benchmark of 70 percent. The June 2021 year-to-date performance is 66 percent which is lower than the threshold.

In January and the early part of February 2021, the contact centres experienced a challenging mix of call volumes and high average handle time that resulted in non-emergency telephone service factors for each month being below threshold levels. Opportunities to enhance operational activities and processes were identified and performance returned to above threshold levels in March, with performance at or above threshold levels being sustained since that time. Due to the large volume experienced in the first quarter of the year compared to the rest of the year, the year-to-date performance as at June remains below threshold; however, FEI expects that the annual performance threshold will be met should the current performance levels continue as expected. Despite challenges with the telephone service factor and average speed of answer in the early part of the year, the overall impact on customer experience and service quality has been mitigated by continued strong performance with first contact resolution. As such, the customer service index has remained high throughout the period.

For comparison, the Company's results under the 2014 to 2019 PBR Plan, the 2020 results and the June 2021 year-to-date results are provided below.

4
5
43.1 Please elaborate on the challenging mix of call volumes and why those contributed
6
to high average handle time.

# 8 **Response:**

7

9 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 23.1 and 23.4. 10 11 12 13 14 43.2 Please discuss the opportunities to enhance operational activities that were 15 undertaken and how those contributed to improved results. 16 17 **Response:** 18 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 23.4.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Annual Review for 2022 Delivery Rates (Application) Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC)

Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 80

## 1 44. Reference: Exhibit B-2, page 160 and 161

## Average Speed of Answer

The Average Speed of Answer (ASA) is an informational indicator that measures the amount of time it takes for a customer service representative to answer a customer's call (seconds).

The 2020 result was 72 seconds and was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. The June 2021 year-to-date performance is 80 seconds. As described above, challenges experienced in the contact centre in January and February of 2021 resulted in monthly non-emergency TSF

2

3

performance levels below the threshold. Comparatively, the ASA also experienced challenges during January and February and, aligned with the recovery to threshold levels of TSF, the monthly ASA also returned to typical levels of less than one minute beginning in March. Relative to previous years, both 2020 and 2021 are higher; however, they remain within a reasonable range from a customer experience perspective in that, on average for the year, calls to the contact centre were answered in just over one minute in 2020 and currently approximately one minute and thirty seconds in 2021.

For comparison, the Company's results under the 2014 to 2019 PBR Plan, the 2020 results and the June 2021 year-to-date results are provided below.

Description	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	June 2021 YTD
Annual Results	34	37	40	34	35	39	72	80
Benchmark	n/a							
Threshold	n/a							

Table 13-13: Average Speed of Answer

4 5 6

7

44.1 Why was the average speed of answer impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic? Please explain.

# 8 Response:

9 There has not been a specific quantifiable or measurable impact on the average speed of answer 10 (ASA) in 2020 that the Company can directly attribute to the COVID-19 pandemic. The average 11 speed of answer is influenced by several variables that affect the volume, duration and type of 12 interactions supported by the contact centre. The reference to the COVID-19 pandemic affecting 13 the ASA was referring to the COVID-19 pandemic being a variable from a broad perspective that 14 has affected customer needs and requirements in 2020 and, as such, has been an overarching 15 influence on call volumes, durations and types of calls.

- 16
- 17
- 18

19 44.2 Please provide monthly figures for 2019, 2020 and 2021.



#### 1 **Response:**

- 2 Please refer to the table below for the monthly ASA for 2019 to 2021(YTD). Please note that this
- 3 data includes all queues, including emergency.

4

Month	2019	2020	2021
January	39.81	44.12	250.03
February	43.91	50.22	96.51
March	36.69	60.30	35.62
April	35.41	35.56	47.19
May	35.31	15.75	44.81
June	36.47	21.31	27.23
July	35.69	28.01	36.23
August	36.51	58.61	25.52
September	45.96	148.62	
October	33.27	268.88	
November	48.12	56.14	
December	35.82	30.74	
Grand Total	38.51	71.98	68.88

# Monthly Average Speed of Answer (Seconds)

5

6 As with annual fluctuations in ASA, monthly fluctuations occur as a result of variations in call

7 volume, duration and types of calls. The longer ASA occurrences in September and October of

8 2020 are attributable to the introduction of a new rebate queue within the gas contact centres.

9 The longer ASA occurrences in January and February of 2021 are explained in the responses to

10 BCUC IR1 23.1 and 23.4.