FEI APPROVAL OF REVISED-RENEWAL RATE FOR LANGFORD

 CNG FUELING STATIONS
 EXHIBIT B-2



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

February 25, 2021

British Columbia Utilities Commission Suite 410, 900 Howe Street Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 2N3

Attention: Mr. Patrick Wruck, Commission Secretary

Dear Mr. Wruck:

Re: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI)

Project No. 1599169

Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the Province's Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Clean Energy) Regulation (GGRR) in Langford, BC (Application)

Response to the British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

On December 23, 2020, FEI filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with BCUC Order G-6-21 setting out the Regulatory Timetable for the review of the Application, FEI respectfully submits the attached response to BCUC IR No. 1.

If further information is required, please contact Sarah Smith at (604) 592-7874.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC ENERGY INC.

Original signed:

Diane Roy

Attachments



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)

Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 1

1	1.0	Reference:	INTRODUCTION						
2			Exhibit B-1, Application, Table 3, pp. 1–2, 4, 6						
3			ColdStar and GFL fueling agreements						
4		On pages 1 to 2 of the Application, FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI) states:							
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Servic will be agree attach Agree a cost GJs p	ecember 17, 2020, ColdStar and GFL have both entered into new Fueling es Agreements with FEI for fueling at the Langford Fueling Station. GFL e a new customer at the Langford Fueling Station. The two executed ments (collectively, the ColdStar and GFL Fueling Agreements) are ed in Appendix A. The rates proposed in the ColdStar and GFL Fueling ments are new rates for refueling at the Langford Fueling Station based on of service model that includes the collective volume commitment of 21,000 er year over a new five-year term and will result in recovery of 80 percent 's forecast cost of service of the station over a five-year period.						
14		On page 4 of	the Application, FEI states:						
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		fueling costs fueling recove recove begin CNG cost r	the competitive markets in which Coldstar and GFL operate, a CNG g rate based on 100 percent recovery of the Landford Feuling [sic] Station was not acceptable to ColdStar or GFL. GFL indicated it would not sign a g agreement for the Langford Fueling Station at a 100 percent cost ery rate. On the other hand, ColdStar indicated that, at a 100 percent cost ery rate, they would only renew their fueling agreement on a spot basis, to retire their existing CNG trucks, and make no further investments in new vehicles. This scenario would reduce revenue from the station and increase recovery risk for FEI's other non-bypass customers. As such, it was sary for FEI to negotiate a market competitive rate with Coldstar and GFL.						
25 26 27			the Application, FEI provides a table that compares the current rates and rates for compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling service at the Langford n.						
28 29 30 31		of the	e clarify why the proposed rates are considered market competitive. As part response, please discuss who in the market, if any, FEI compared the sed rates to determine that the proposed rates are competitive.						

32 Response:

The proposed rates are considered market competitive because CNG fueling station customers compare the rates with their competing transport fuel options, such as diesel fuel (based on diesel litre equivalent prices) when determining if the rates meet their market competitive requirements. At the time of writing, the average price per litre for diesel fuel in the Victoria area



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 2

for the month of December 2020 was \$1.14¹. The proposed rates will allow ColdStar and GFL to fuel at the Langford Fueling Station at a competitive rate of approximately \$0.61² per diesel litre equivalent. With year-over-year decreasing vehicle capital incentives under the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Regulation (GGRR), NGT customers are seeking a competitive rate that provides a fuel savings that continues to support their ongoing and future investments in natural gas powered vehicles.

Additionally, the proposed rates are within the price range of other FEI natural gas fueling
stations. In 2020, the base rate for FEI-owned stations (Capital Rate, O&M Rate, and OH&M
Rate) ranged from \$3.250 per GJ to \$13.541 per GJ. As such, the proposed base rate of
\$7.226 per GJ for the Langford CNG Fueling Station falls in the middle of this range.

- 11
- 12
- 13
- 141.2Please discuss whether the market competitive rate negotiated with ColdStar15Solutions Inc. (ColdStar) and GFL Environmental Inc. (GFL) is a fixed dollar16amount per GJ, as set out as the proposed rates in Table 3 of the Application, or1780 percent of the forecast cost of service of the Langford Fueling Station. In other18words, if the station's forecast cost of service changes, would the proposed19fueling rate change such that it would recover 80 percent of the updated forecast20cost of service?
- 20

22 Response:

23 The proposed rates in Table 3 of the Application have been negotiated with ColdStar and GFL as a fixed dollar amount per GJ. FEI has executed the Fueling Services Agreement with 24 25 ColdStar and GFL based on a fueling rate which they deemed to be competitive in the market 26 as compared to their alternatives, allowing them to justify their continued operation of their NGT 27 fleets. Given that the rates are a fixed dollar amount per GJ, if the station's forecast cost of 28 service changes (increases or decreases), the cost recovery percentage would change based 29 on the updated forecast cost of service; however, absent the need for capital expansions, FEI 30 does not expect to update the station's forecast cost of service until the expiry of these 31 agreements. This method of setting and escalating rates over the term of the contract is 32 consistent with the approach that FEI has taken for all other CNG and LNG stations, has been 33 accepted by the BCUC, and is consistent with the requirements of the GGRR. Further, station 34 rates that are set based on customer volumes and are acceptable to customers will support 35 continued investment in, and adoption and growth of, natural gas for transportation.

Source: <u>https://www2.nrcan.gc.ca/eneene/sources/pripri/prices_bycity_e.cfm?productID=5&locationID=3&frequency=M&priceYear=2020&Redisplay=.</u>

² This is an all in cost of diesel equivalent of CNG including capital, O&M, OH&M, Commodity, Delivery and applicable taxes.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application) Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR)

No. 1

Page 3

1	2.0 R	leference:	PROPOSED RATES
2			Exhibit B-1, Table 2, pp. 1, 5
3			Committed and short-term spot volumes
4	C	On page 1 of	the Application, FEI states:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Utilitie Langfo (Origir effecti an ini Fuelin fuel a	der G-187-13, dated November 19, 2013, the BCUC [British Columbia s Commission] approved FEI's rates for providing fueling service from the ord Fueling Station, as set out in the CNG fueling service agreement hal Fueling Agreement) between FEI and ColdStar. The rates were ve beginning on the in-service date of the Langford Fueling Station and for tial term of five years, which ended on January 1, 2019. The Original g Agreement included a two-year renewal term which allowed ColdStar to t the station until December 31, 2020. ColdStar has been the "anchor " for the Langford Fueling Station since it went into service in 2014.
14		[]	
15 16 17 18 19		BCUC from t FEI re	lition to ColdStar, there are currently five other customers approved by the for fuelling at the Langford Fueling Station. The overall demand served he Langford Fueling Station in the first five years of operation resulted in covering approximately 117 percent of the forecasted cost of service in the al Fueling Agreement.
20	2	.1 Please	e provide the following information for the first five years of operation:
21 22 23		(i)	The actual cost of service of the Langford Fueling Station broken down by the cost categories presented in Schedule 1 of Appendix D to the Application;
24 25 26		(ii)	The dollar amount and the percentage of the actual cost of service of the Langford Fueling Station that was recovered from the overall demand served from the station;
27 28 29		(iiij) The dollar amount and the percentage of the actual cost of service of the Langford Fueling Station that was recovered from/refunded to FEI's non-bypass ratepayers; and
30 31 32	<u>Respon</u>	•) Identify the years used in the above calculations.

Please refer to Table 1 below for item (i) providing the actual cost of service broken down by
cost categories for the first five years of operation, and item (iv) which is for the years 2014 to
2018. FEI notes that actual O&M costs shown in Table 1 below reflect the updated actual O&M
costs as set out in BCUC IR1 4.1.



1 Table 1 – Breakdown of actual revenue requirement of the Langford Fueling Station (2014 to 2018)

Line	Particulars	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	<u>Revenue Requirement (\$000s)</u>					
2	Operation and Maintenance	54	38	32	48	283
3	Property Taxes	4	4	4	4	4
4	Depreciation Expense	57	57	57	57	58
5	Amortization Expense	1	1	1	1	1
6	Other Revenue	-	-	-	-	-
7	Income Taxes	0	(30)	(18)	(9)	(2)
8	Earned Return	82	78	74	70	67
9	Annual Revenue Requirement (\$000s)	199	148	151	172	411

2 3

5

6

7

4 Please refer to Table 2 below for the requested information as follows:

- For item (ii), please refer to Line 17 and Line 20 for the total dollar amount and percentage, respectively, for the actual cost of service recovered from the Langford Fueling Station; and
- For item (iii), please refer to Line 22 and Line 23 for the total dollar amount and percentage <u>recovered</u> from non-bypass customers over the period from 2014 to 2018.
- 10

11Table 2 – Summary of Cost of Service recovered from fueling customers and FEI's non-bypass12customers from 2014 to 2018

Line	Particulars	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
1	Capital Rate (\$/GJ)	2013 Appendix B, Sch 11, Line 31	7.529	7.680	7.833	7.990	8.150
2	O&M Rate (\$/GJ)	2013 Appendix B, Sch 11, Line 32	2.683	2.710	2.740	2.792	2.848
3	Total Annual Volumetric Rate (\$/GJ)	Sum of Line 1 to Line 2	10.212	10.390	10.573	10.782	10.998
4	Total Annual Volume (TJ)	Actual Volume	15.281	20.636	21.280	20.301	22.336
5 6	Annual Cost of Service Collected over Contract Term (\$)	(Line 3 x Line 4) x 1000	156,052	214,410	224,991	218,881	245,651
7	Short Term Charge Rate (\$/GJ)		1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
8	Spot Charge Rate (\$/GJ)		1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
9	Annual Volume (TJ) that attracts Spot Charge and Short Term	Actual Volume	-	1.664	0.943	0.896	0.948
10	Annual Volume (TJ) that attracts Spot Only Charge	Actual Volume	-	-	-	0.591	1.161
11	Revenue Collected on Spot Charge and Short Term Charge (\$)	(Line 7 + Line 8) x Line 9 x 1000	-	3,328	1,886	1,792	1,896
12	Revenue Collected on Spot Charge (\$)	(Line 8 x Line 10) x 1000	-	-	-	591	1,161
13							
14	Total Revenue Collected (\$)	Line 5 + Line 11 + Line 12	156,052	217,738	226,877	221,264	248,707
15	Total Cost of Service (\$)	Actual Cost of Service	198,653	148,029	150,606	171,509	410,998
16							
17	Sum of Total Revenue Recovered (\$)	Sum of Line 14	1,070,638				
18	Sum of Total COS (\$)	Sum of Line 15	1,079,793				
19							
20	% of COS recovered from fueling customers	Line 17 / Line 18	99%				
21							
22	Amount refunded or (recovered) from non-bypass ratepayers	Line 17 - Line 18	(9,155)				
23	% of COS refunded or (recovered) from non-bypass ratepayer	Line 21 / Line 18	-1%				



No. 1

Page 5

- 1
- 2
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 6

7

2.2 Please provide the same information as in the preceding information request (IR), but for the period from when the station went into service to December 31, 2020.

8 **Response:**

9 Please refer to Table 1 below for item (i) providing the actual cost of service broken down by 10 cost categories for the period since the station went into service to December 31, 2020, and

11 item (iv) which is for the years 2014 to 2020. FEI notes that actual O&M costs shown in Table 1

12 below reflect the updated actual O&M costs as set out in BCUC IR1 4.1.

Lin	e Particulars	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Revenue Requirement (\$000s)							
2	Operation and Maintenance	54	38	32	48	283	109	66
3	Property Taxes	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
4	Depreciation Expense	57	57	57	57	58	58	58
5	Amortization Expense	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	Other Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Income Taxes	0	(30)	(18)	(9)	(2)	4	9
8	Earned Return	82	78	74	70	67	62	58
9	Annual Revenue Requirement (\$000s)	199	148	151	172	411	238	195

13 Table 1 – Breakdown of actual revenue requirement of the Langford Fueling Station (2014 to 2020)

15

16 Please refer to Table 2 below for the requested information as follows:

For item (ii), please refer to Line 17 and Line 20 for the total dollar amount and percentage, respectively, for the actual cost of service recovered from the Langford Fueling Station between 2014 and 2020; and

• For item (iii), please refer to Line 22 and Line 23 for the total dollar amount and percentage <u>refunded</u> to non-bypass customers over the period from 2014 to 2020.



1

2

Table 2 – Summary of Cost of Service recovered from fueling customers and FEI's non-bypass customers from 2014 to 2020

Line	Particulars	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Capital Rate (\$/GJ)	2013 Appendix B, Schedule 11, Line 3	7.529	7.680	7.833	7.990	8.150	8.313	8.479
2	O&M Rate (\$/GJ)	2013 Appendix B, Schedule 11, Line 3	2.683	2.710	2.740	2.792	2.848	2.933	2.995
3	Total Annual Volumetric Rate (\$/GJ)	Sum of Line 1 to Line 2	10.212	10.390	10.573	10.782	10.998	11.246	11.474
4	Total Annual Volume (TJ)	Actual Volume	15.281	20.636	21.280	20.301	22.336	20.403	25.418
5	Annual Cost of Service Collected over Contract Term (\$)	(Line 3 x Line 4) x 1000	156,052	214,410	224,991	218,881	245,651	229,449	291,653
6									
7	Short Term Charge Rate (\$/GJ)		1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
8	Spot Charge Rate (\$/GJ)	_	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
9	Annual Volume (TJ) that attracts Spot Charge and Short Term	Actual Volume	-	1.664	0.943	0.896	0.948	0.646	0.840
10	Annual Volume (TJ) that attracts Spot Only Charge	Actual Volume	-	-	-	0.591	1.161	1.079	1.028
11	Revenue Collected on Spot Charge and Short Term Charge (\$)	(Line 7 + Line 8) x Line 9 x 1000	-	3,328	1,886	1,792	1,896	1,292	1,679
12	Revenue Collected on Spot Charge (\$)	(Line 8 x Line 10) x 1000	-	-	-	591	1,161	1,079	1,028
13									
14	Total Revenue Collected (\$)	Line 5 + Line 11 + Line 12	156,052	217,738	226,877	221,264	248,707	231,820	294,361
15	Total Cost of Service (\$)	Actual Cost of Service	198,653	148,029	150,606	171,509	410,998	238,253	195,411
16									
17	Sum of Total Revenue Recovered (\$)	Sum of Line 14	1,596,819						
18	Sum of Total COS (\$)	Sum of Line 15	1,513,457						
19									
20	% of COS recovered from fueling customers	Line 17 / Line 18	106%						
21									
22	Amount refunded or (recovered) from non-bypass ratepayers	Line 17 - Line 18	83,362						
3 23	% of COS refunded or (recovered) from non-bypass ratepayer	Line 21 / Line 18	6%						

- 4
- 5
- 6

7

On page 5 of the Application, FEI states:

8 In addition to the volume commitments in the ColdStar and GFL Fueling 9 Agreements, FEI has had approximately 5,000 GJs of demand from other third 10 party customers in 2020 at the Langford station. FEI expects that the 5,000 GJs 11 will continue to be consumed by these customers on a go forward basis.

12 In Table 2 of the Application, FEI provides a comparison of the percentage of recovery of 13 the Langford Fueling Station's cost of service from a firm volume commitment for the 14 next five years (i.e. 2021 to 2025) from ColdStar and GFL versus a short-term spot 15 volume scenario.

- 16 2.3 Please explain why FEI expects the other third-party customers at the Langford
 17 Fueling Station to continue consuming 5,000 GJs per year on a go-forward basis.
 18 Would the proposed rates impact these customers' future consumption?
- 19

20 **Response:**

FEI expects approximately 5,000 GJs of fueling consumption from third-party customers at the Langford Fueling Station on a go-forward basis based on customer indications and their historical fueling consumption.³ Third-party fueling consumption is not factored into the

³ Approximate annual third-party consumption in 2020 – 5,200 GJs; 2019 – 4,600 GJs; 2018 – 5,000 GJs.



Langford Fueling Station rates; therefore, any consumption by third-party customers leads to a
 greater cost recovery for the station generally.

Please also refer to the response to BCUC IR1 6.3, where FEI discusses a change to its proposal for third-party agreement customer rates by applying existing third-party agreement rates to any new third-party agreements at the same station. To the extent that third-party customer rates are in a range that is considered market competitive, there is unlikely to be any impact on third-party customers' future consumption at a station solely as a result of the rate. Future consumption from third-party customers is typically influenced more by other factors such as geographic location of the station relative to driving routes the customers' fleets travel.

- 10
- 11
- 12

17

- 132.4Please expand Table 2 to include the next 20 years (i.e. 2021 to 2040) and14include the volume for the five other customers of the station under the15assumption that these customers would continue consuming 5,000 GJ each year16on a go forward basis (i.e. add 5,000 to lines 4 and 13).
- 18 **Response:**

19 In an effort to be responsive, FEI has expanded Table 2 as requested; however, doing so 20 requires assumptions about station use and volume throughput that may not reflect the actual 21 operation and usage of the station in years beyond the term of the agreements. For example, to 22 assume that a volume commitment of 26,000 GJ will be maintained over a 20-year period is 23 uncertain given that a CNG vehicle life expectancy is less than 10 years under regular usage 24 conditions. Further, in the case of the Langford Fueling Station, it will be fully depreciated 25 before 2040. Thus, this hypothetical analysis is assuming that the station will be operated past 26 its useful life with no additional capital added to the station in future years to extend the useful 27 life. In consideration of the issues with projecting 20 years into the future, FEI has expanded 28 Table 2 as requested, based on the following assumptions:

- Capital and O&M rates remain constant only increasing by inflation at 2 percent each year;
- Firm volume commitment from current customers (GFL and ColdStar) at the station remains constant over the next 20 years without any additional third-party customers added; and
- No sustainment capital is required from 2021 to 2040.
- 35

	FORTIS	BC [™]
--	--------	-----------------

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 8

int	Particular	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2025	2021	2029	2029	2030	2031	20012	2033	2004	2015	2056	20,37	2058	2036	2040
ē	PV Tetal COS	Appendix C. Schedule 10, Line 82	173,345	165,057	156.327	147,606	139,030	129,280	121,394	113,839	106,638	99,805	93.340	87,241	81,499	76,101	37,554	35,118	34,041	32,984	31,949	30,939
2	Sum of PV Total COS	Sum of Line 1	1,893,084																			
3																						
4	Updated Volume Consumption (GJ)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 77	26,000	26,000	25,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	25,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
5	Proposed Capital Rate (\$/GJ)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 74	4.420	4.509	4.599	4.691	4.786	4.805	4.825	4.845	4.865	4.885	4.905	4.925	4.945	4.965	4.985	5.005	5.025	5.045	5.065	5.065
6	Proposed O&M Rate (\$/GJ)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 75	2.286	2.331	2.378	2.426	2,474	2.523	2.543	2.563	2 583	2.603	2.623	2.643	2.663	2.683	2.703	2.723	2.743	2.763	2.783	2.803
7	Proposed Total Rate (\$/GJ)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 75	6,706	6.840	6.977	7.117	7.250	7.328	7.368	7.408	7.448	7.488	7.528	7.568	7.608	7,648	7.688	7,728	7,768	7.808	7.648	7.888
8	Revenue at Committed Volume (\$)	Line 7 x Line 4	174,356	177,840	181,402	185,042	188,734	190,540	191,580	192,620	193,660	184,700	195,740	196,780	197,820	198,860	199,900	200,940	201,980	203,020	204,060	205,100
9	PV of Revenue at Committed (5)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 80	165,313	159,871	154,616	149.538	144,612	138,424	131,961	125,796	119,916	114,307	108,958	103.855	98,989	94,349	89.923	85,703	81,679	77,841	74,182	70,893
10	Sum of PV Revenue at Committed (5)	Sum of Line 9	2,290,528																			
11	% Recovery w/ Committed Volume	Line 10 / Line 2	121%																			
12																						
13	Updated Volume at Spot (GJ)	Estimated Spot Volume	20,000	15,000	10,000	7,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5.000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
14	Capital Rate (\$/GJ)	Current Capital Rate + 2% Inflation	8.649	8.822	8.998	9.178	9.382	9.382	9.402	9.422	9,442	9.462	9.482	9.502	9.522	9.542	9.562	9.582	9.602	9.822	9.642	9.662
15	O&M Rate (\$/GJ)	Appendix C, Schedule 10, Line 75	2.286	2.331	2.378	2.426	2,474	2.494	2.514	2.534	2.554	2.574	2.594	2.614	2.634	2,654	2.674	2.694	2.714	2.734	2.754	2.774
16	Spot and Short Charge (\$/GJ)		2.000	2.000	2,000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2,000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2,000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2,000	2.000	2.000
17	Spot Total Rate (\$/GJ)	Sum of Line 14 to Line 16	12.934	13.153	13.378	13.604	13.838	13.876	13.916	13.956	13.996	14.036	14.076	14.116	14.156	14.195	14.236	14.276	14.316	14.356	14.396	14.436
18	Revenue at Spot Volume (\$)	Line 13 x Line 17	258,686	197,295	133,760	95,225	69,178	69,378	69,578	69,778	69,978	70,178	70,378	70,578	70,778	70,978	71,178	71,378	71,578	71,778	71,978	72,178
19	PV of Revenue at Spot (\$)		245,269	177,360	114,009	76.954	53,006	50,402	47,926	45,571	43,331	41,201	39,175	37,249	35,417	33,675	32,019	30,444	28,945	27,521	26,188	24,878
20	Sum of PV Revenue at Spot (\$)	Sum of Line 19	1,210,519																			
21	% Recovery w/ Spot Volume	Line 20 / Line 2	64%																			
22																						

T



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

5

2.5 Please explain how FEI estimated ColdStar's annual spot volumes (line 13). Please provide any assumptions used.

6 **Response:**

7 Absent what it considered a market competitive rate, ColdStar indicated to FEI that it would not be willing to enter into a firm agreement with a volume commitment and would slowly start 8 9 retiring its existing CNG fleet by fueling on a spot basis. Under that scenario, FEI calculated 10 that each CNG truck consumed on average 600-700 GJs per year and estimated the spot 11 volume based on the truck retirement schedule provided by ColdStar. ColdStar assumed that it 12 would operate 23 trucks in year 1 and retire approximately 7 trucks every year, completing 13 retirement of its current fleet by the end of year 3. Table 1 below provides the anticipated truck retirement schedule and estimated total volume consumption by year. 14

Year	Trucks Operating	Estimated Total Volume Consumption (GJ)
2021	23	15,000
2022	16	10,000
2023	9	5,000
2024	0	0

15



No. 1

1	3.0	Reference:	PROPOSED RATES
2			Exhibit B-1, p. 6; Appendix D, Schedules 7, 8; Exhibit A2-1, FEI
3			Application for Approval of Rate Design and Rates for Constructing
4			and Operating a CNG Refueling Station under the Greenhouse Gas
5			Reduction (Clean Energy) Regulation (GGRR) for ColdStar
6			(ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application), dated September 19, 2013,
7			Appendix B, Schedules 7, 8
8			Cost of service model – Capital Rate
9		On page 6 of	the Application, FEI states:
10		The p	proposed 2021 total dispensing rates reflect a \$4.768 per GJ decrease
11		comp	ared to the current rates primarily due to a lower undepreciated value of the

- the 12 station (\$0.812 million as of December 31, 2020), a lower cost recovery from 91 13 percent to 80 percent, and an increased volume commitment of 21,000 GJs per 14 year.
- 15 The following table prepared by BCUC staff summarizes the gross plant in service and 16 the accumulated depreciation at the beginning of 2021 presented respectively in 17 Schedules 7 and 8 of Appendix D to the Application.

(\$000's)	Gross Plant in	Accumulated	Undepreciated
	Service	Depreciation	Value
CNG Dispensing	962	(287)	675
Equipment			
CNG Foundations	142	(43)	99
CNG Dehydrator	53	(16)	37
Total	1,158	(345)	812

18

The following table prepared by BCUC staff summarizes the gross plant in service and 19 the accumulated depreciation at the beginning of 2021 presented respectively in 20 21 Schedules 7 and 8 of Appendix B to the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application.

(\$000's)	Gross Plant in Service	Accumulated Depreciation	Undepreciated Value
CNG Dispensing Equipment	1,015	(355)	660
Foundation	99	(35)	64
NG Dehydrator	51	(18)	33
Total	1,165	(408)	757

22 23

3.1 Please reconcile the gross plant in service and accumulated depreciation in the Application with the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application.



1 Response:

- 2 Please refer to Table 1 and Table 2 below for the reconciliations of the current gross plant in
- 3 service (GPIS) and the accumulated depreciation, respectively, with the original ColdStar-
- 4 Langford 2013 Application.
- 5 FEI notes the following:
- 6 As noted in response to BCUC IR1 7.1 of the original ColdStar-Langford 2013 7 Application and as accepted by the BCUC, the Capital Rate was not adjusted for the actual construction costs incurred because there was no requirement under the GGRR 8 9 to adjust rates to account for actual costs. The 2014 Gross Plant in Service (GPIS) 10 difference shown on Line 24 of Table 1 below is the difference between the forecast and the actual construction costs for the Langford Fueling Station. 11
- 12 There were also some small additional capital expenditures on the station in 2015 and 13 2017 (see Line 8 of the actual GPIS amounts in Table 1 below). The 2015 and 2017 14 capital expenditures did not trigger a change in the Capital Rate because the station 15 continued to recover more than 91 percent of the cost of service as per the original 16 ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application and continued to meet the minimum GGRR 17 requirement of 80 percent recovery of the forecasted cost of service.
- 18

19 While responding to this information request, FEI discovered that the opening balance of the 20 accumulated depreciation amount in the cost of service model for 2021 in the current Application was not correct. As a result, FEI has recalculated the station rates with the correct 21 22 accumulated depreciation as well as updating the property tax rate, as discussed in the 23 response to BCUC IR1 5.1. The updated accumulated depreciation and property tax resulted in 24 a lower Capital Rate of \$4.286 in 2021.

25 However, FEI is not proposing any changes to the currently proposed rates established in the 26 agreements with ColdStar and GFL. As discussed in the response to BCUC IR1 1.1, the 27 proposed Langford Fueling Station rates as set out in the agreements were designed to provide 28 a market competitive rate that was acceptable to ColdStar and GFL. Rather than entering into 29 amending agreements with ColdStar and GFL, FEI believes the proposed station rates in the 30 agreements should remain unchanged, which would increase the recovery of the forecast cost of service over the term of the agreements from 80 percent to 82 percent. 31



1 2 No. 1

Table 1 – Reconciliation of the gross plant in service between actual GPIS in the Application and the GPIS reported in the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application

Cold Star - Langford: Gross Plant in Service Reconciliation

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

	Actual Gross Plant in Service Amounts								
Line	Particulars	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Gross Plant in Service, Beginning								
2	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Preceeding Year, Line 14		948	950	950	962	962	962
3	CNG Foundation Preceeding Year, Line 15		1	142	142	142	142	142	142
4	CNG Dehydrator	IG Dehydrator Preceeding Year, Line 16		53	53	53	53	53	53
5	Total Gross Plant in Service, Beginning	Preceeding Year, Line 17	+	1,143	1,145	1,145	1,158	1,158	1,158
6									
7	Gross Plant in Service, Additions								
8	CNG Dispensing Equipment		948	2	<u> </u>	12	12	1	*
9	CNG Foundation		142		- 5		2	1	-
10	CNG Dehydrator		53	<u> </u>	*		<u> </u>		
11 12	Total Gross Plant in Service, Additions		1,143	2	*	12	3		*
13	Gross Plant in Service, Ending								
14	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Line 2 + Line 8	948	950	950	962	962	962	962
15	CNG Foundation	Line 3 + Line 9	142	142	142	142	142	142	142
16	CNG Dehydrator	Line 4 + Line 10	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
17	Total Gross Plant in Service, Ending	Sum of Lines 14 through 16	1,143	1,145	1,145	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
	Provide a Net State of a different for the state of the s	and a firm of the							
tion	Forecasted 2013 Langford Gross Plant in Se Particulars	Reference	2014	2045	2016	2017	2010	2010	2020
Line 1	Gross Plant in Service, Beginning	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
2		Proceeding Vote Line 14		1,015	1,015	1.015	1.015	1.015	1,015
3	CNG Dispensing Equipment CNG Foundation	Preceeding Year, Line 14		1,015	1,015	1,015	1,015 99	1,015	1,015
		Preceeding Year, Line 15				1.0.0			
4	CNG Dehydrator	Preceeding Year, Line 16		51		51		51	
5	Total Gross Plant in Service, Beginning	Preceeding Year, Line 17	*	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165
7	Gross Plant in Service, Additions								
8	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 7, Lines 10	1.015		**	-			
9	CNG Foundation	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 7, Lines 11	99		2	8		1	+
10	CNG Dehydrator	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 7, Lines 12	51	- 1				14	0.40
11	Total Gross Plant in Service, Additions	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 7, Lines 13	1,165		~	-		-	
12		(1. March 1. Construction of the second s	240250						
13	Gross Plant in Service, Ending								
14	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Line 2 + Line 8	1,015	1.015	1.015	1.015	1.015	1,015	1.015
15	CNG Foundation	Line 3 + Line 9	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
16	CNG Dehydrator	Line 4 + Line 10	51	51	51	51	51	51	51
17	Total Gross Plant in Service, Ending	Sum of Lines 14 through 16	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,165	1.165
18	rotal dross Plant In Service, Ending	Sum of cines 14 through 10	4+400	4,205	4,100	1,100	4,403	1,105	4,400
19									
20	Difference between Actual and Forecast G	DIS							
21	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Forecasted Line 14 - Actual Line 14	68	65	65	53	53	53	53
22	CNG Foundation	Forecasted Line 14 - Actual Line 14 Forecasted Line 15 - Actual Line 15	(44)	65 (44)	(44)	(44)	(44)	(44)	(44)
23	CNG Dehydrator	Forecasted Line 15 - Actual Line 15 Forecasted Line 16 - Actual Line 16		2002		- 0.00			
	이 방법 방법 방법 방법 이 것이 물건이 있는 것이 많이 많다.		(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
24	Total Gross Plant in Service, Difference	Sum of Lines 21 through 23	22	19	19	7	7	7	7



No. 1

1 2 3

Table 2 – Reconciliation of the accumulated depreciation between the actual accumulated depreciation in the Application and the accumulated depreciation reported in the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application

Cold Star - Langford: Accumulated Depreciation & Amortization

(\$000's), un	less otherwise stated
---------------	-----------------------

Line	Particulars	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
9	Actual-Accumulated Depreciation		-						
2									
1	Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning								
К. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Preceeding Year, Line 16	54	(47)	(95)	(142)	(190)	(239)	(287)
÷	Foundation	Preceeding Year, Line 17	27	(7)	(14)	(21)	(28)	(36)	(43)
5	NG Dehydrator	Preceeding Year, Line 18		(3)	(5)	(8)	(11)	(13)	(16)
	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning	Sum of Lines 4 through 6	14	(57)	(114)	(172)	(230)	(287)	(345)
Ê.									
é -	Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense1								
0	CNG Dispensing Equipment@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 10	(47)	(48)	(48)	(48)	(48)	(48)	(48)
1	Foundation@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 11	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
2	NG Dehydrator@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 12	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
3	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense	Sum of Lines 10 through 12	(57)	(57)	(57)	(58)	(58)	(58)	(58)
4			10-10	1000	35559.	1000		14-124	
5	Accumulated Depreciation, Ending								
6	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Line 4 + Line 10	(47)	(95)	(142)	(190)	(239)	(287)	(335)
7	Foundation	Line 5 + Line 11	(7)	(14)	(21)	(28)	(36)	(43)	(50)
8	NG Dehydrator	Line 6 + Line 12	(3)	(5)	(8)	(11)	(13)	(16)	(19)
19	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Ending	Sum of Lines 16 through 18	(57)	(114)	(172)	(230)	(287)	(345)	(403)
Line	Particulars	Reference	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Forecasted 2013 Langford Accumulated Depreciation	Construction and the second	-				LULU .	LUA.	and a second
Ê.									
£	Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning								
	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Preceeding Year, Line 16	12	(51)	(102)	(152)	(203)	(254)	(305)
8	Foundation	Preceeding Year, Line 17	4	(5)	(10)	(15)	(20)	(25)	(30)
5	NG Dehydrator	Preceeding Year, Line 18	1	(3)	(5)	(8)	(10)	(13)	(15)
	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning	Sum of Lines 4 through 6		(58)	(116)	(175)	(233)	(291)	(349)
				()	1	10.01	120.01	freed	10.001
	Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense1								
0	CNG Dispensing Equipment@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 10	(51)	(51)	(51)	(51)	(51)	(51)	(51)
1	Foundation@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 11	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
2	NG Dehydrator@ 5%	Appendix B 2013 Application, Schedule 8, Line 12	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
3	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense	Sum of Lines 10 through 12	(58)	(58)	(58)	(58)	(58)	(58)	(58)
4			94		44			1	1.1.1
15	Accumulated Depreciation, Ending								
6	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Line 4 + Line 10	(51)	(102)	(152)	(203)	(254)	(305)	(355)
7	Foundation	Line 5 + Line 11	(5)	(10)	(15)	(20)	(25)	(30)	(35)
8	NG Dehydrator	Line 6 + Line 12	(3)	(5)	(8)	(10)	(13)	(15)	(18)
9	Total Accumulated Depreciation, Ending	Sum of Lines 16 through 18	(58)	(116)	(175)	(233)	(291)	(349)	(408)
50	Total Accomplated Depresation, chang	Sum of chies to through to	1501	(110)	(275)	12331	(202)	(545)	14001
1	Difference between Actual and Forecast GPIS								
12	CNG Dispensing Equipment	Forecasted Line 16 - Actual Line 16	(3)	(7)	(10)	(13)	(15)	(18)	(21)
3	CNG Foundation	Forecasted Line 17 - Actual Line 17	2	4	7	9	11	13	15
4	CNG Dehydrator	Forecasted Line 17 - Actual Line 17	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
15	2012년 1월 201					(3)	(4)	(4)	
	Total Gross Plant in Service, Difference	Sum of Lines 22 through 24	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	[4]	(4)	(4)

- 4 5
- 6
- 7

8 Schedule 8 of Appendix B to the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application shows that the
9 fueling station equipment (i.e. the dispensing equipment, foundation and dehydrator) is
10 depreciated straight line over a 20-year period from 2014 to 2033.

11 Schedule 8 of Appendix D to the Application shows that the fueling station equipment 12 (i.e. the dispensing equipment, foundation and dehydrator) is depreciated straight line 13 over a 20-year period from 2021 to 2040.



1

2

3

- 3.2
 - Please explain why the useful life of the Langford Fueling Station is expected to increase by seven years (from 2033 to 2040).

4 **Response:**

5 The useful life of the Langford Fueling station is not expected to increase by seven years.

6 FEI's cost of service model for the CNG fueling station has a 20-year analysis period based on the approved depreciation rates. FEI inadvertently neglected to change the analysis period for

7 8 this Application to 13 years (2021 to 2033) to match the expected remaining useful life of the

9 Langford Fueling Station.

10 The purpose of the cost of service model is to calculate the station rates for the new five-year contract term, based on the present value of the station's cost of service from 2021 to 2025. As 11 12 such, the length of the analysis period in the cost of service model has no impact on the calculation of the station rates over the term of the agreement period from January 1, 2021 to 13 14 December 31, 2025.

15 However, FEI has updated the financial schedules with a 13-year analysis period (i.e., from 16 2021 to 2033) to match the expected remaining useful life of the Langford Fueling Station. The 17 updated financial schedules confirm that the station rates do not change because of the change 18 in the analysis period. The remaining book value in the cost of service model in 2033 is 19 primarily due to the small amount of capital expenditures in 2015 and 2017, as discussed in the 20 response to BCUC IR1 3.1. The updated financial schedules are provided in Attachment 3.2.

- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24 3.3 Please confirm, or explain otherwise, that by increasing the useful life of the 25 Langford Fueling Station by seven years, the station is no longer being 26 depreciated annually at 5 percent.
- 27 28

29

3.3.1 If confirmed, please discuss whether FEI is requesting BCUC approval for new depreciation rates for the fueling station. Why or why not?

30 **Response:**

31 Not confirmed, the Langford Fueling Station is still being depreciated at 5 percent per annum. 32 As discussed in the response to BCUC IR1 3.2, FEI is not increasing the expected useful life of 33 the Langford Station by seven years.

- 34
- 35 36 3.4 Please recalculate the cost of service of the Langford Fueling Station based on a
- 37 38 20-year straight line depreciation from 2014 to 2033 and provide the percentage 39 of the cost service that the proposed fueling rate would recover over the five-year



No. 1

1 2

3

term of the ColdStar and GFL Fueling Agreements. As part of the response, please include the financial schedules with the recalculated cost of service.

4 **Response:**

5 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 3.2 for the updated financial schedules based on an 6 analysis period of 13 years (i.e. 2021 to 2033).

7 As a result of the changes discussed in BCUC IR1 3.1, the percentage of the cost of service that the proposed fueling rate would recover over the five-year term from 2021 to 2025 has 8

9 increased to 82 percent.



No. 1

1	4.0	Reference:	PROPOSED RATES
2			Exhibit B-1, Table 5, pp. 7–8
3			Cost of service model – Operations and Maintenance Rate
4		On page 7 of	the Application, FEI states:
5 6 7 8		foreca an ave	D&M [operations and maintenance] Rate is determine [sic] by using a sted average O&M of the station over the next five years. FEI anticipates erage annual O&M expense of \$60 thousand is required. Below is a table ng the annual O&M for the Langford Fueling Station from 2015 to 2020.

Mara-	(\$) here 0 1190
Year	O&M Spend (\$)
2015	28,257
2016	22,273
2017	38,297
2018	272,568
2019	98,589
2020 (Projected)	62,795
Total	522,779
Average	87,130
Average O&M excluding unplanned upgrades/maintenance*	40,270
*2018 and 2019 estimated O&M expenditure excluding upgrades/maintenance was \$45,000 in each year	unplanned

Table 5: Actual O&M between 2015 and 2019, and Projected 2020 O&M

9 10

On page 8 of the Application, FEI states:

- 11 FEI determines the O&M forecast of \$60 thousand per year based on the 12 historical average O&M costs (exclude unplanned expenditures) plus FEI's estimate preventative maintenance and repair schedule over the next five years. 13 14 FEI believes increasing the forecast O&M to \$60 thousand is reasonable as the preventative maintenance and repair/servicing requirement over the next five 15 years will likely increase from the initial operating years given the hours already 16 17 incurred by the equipment as well as some of the fueling equipment is no longer 18 covered by warranty.
- 194.1Please explain why the O&M expenditure of \$62,795 projected for 2020 is20greater than all of the other years in the above table once the unplanned21upgrades/maintenance in 2018 and 2019 are excluded. As part of the response,22please explain whether the O&M expenditures projected for 2020 is expected to23continue in subsequent years.

25 **Response:**

24

FEI has updated Table 5 with actual O&M expenditure for each year the station was operational and included the 2020 actual O&M expenditures, as at the time of filing the Application, actuals



- 1 were not available for 2020. FEI notes that the electricity costs were inadvertently omitted from
- 2 Table 5 in the Application and have now been included.

3

Updated Table 5: Actual O&M between 2014 and 2020				
Year	O&M Spend (\$)			
2014	54,449			
2015	37,597			
2016	32,270			
2017	47,874			
2018	283,218			
2019	108,840			
2020	65,697			
Total	629,945			
Average	89,992			
Average O&M excluding unplanned upgrades/maintenance*	49,827			

4 5

* 2018 and 2019 estimated O&M expenditure excluding unplanned upgrades/maintenance was \$55,650 and \$55,251 respectively

6

O&M actual expenditure for 2020 of \$65,697 was greater than previous years (after excluding unplanned upgrades/maintenance) because in 2020 FEI conducted a full third party investigation of the site equipment and completed several engineering design modifications to increase operational efficiency and mitigate future failures from occurring. As a result, going forward FEI expects the average preventative maintenance and repair expenditure over the next five years to be less than 2020, resulting in an O&M forecast slightly below the 2020 actual O&M expenditure.

14 While the forecast O&M expenditure for the five-year renewal term is \$60 thousand per year. 15 which is higher than the overall average of \$50 thousand per year for O&M expenditures experienced for the station in the past, FEI expects this will be the O&M level for the station 16 17 going forward. This is because the Langford Fueling Station has experienced customer load 18 growth in recent years that has increased the operational demand on the station relative to its 19 initial in-service years. Additionally, as the station equipment ages, components approach their 20 end of service life and require replacement or recertification. Components nearing their end of 21 service life in the coming years include actuator valves, transducers, cylinders, pistons, rods, 22 and relief valves. Aging components are factored into preventative maintenance and repair 23 forecasts and, as a result, the expected preventative maintenance and repair forecast for the 24 proposed O&M Rate is higher relative to the initial in-service years of the station. FEI believes 25 that the forecast O&M of \$60 thousand per year over the next five years is reasonable having 26 taken into account the station load growth, aging equipment and electricity costs.

27



1 2

3

4

5

6

7

4.2 Please provide the forecast O&M for the preventative maintenance and repair over the next five years and how these amounts were determined. As part of the response, please discuss whether the forecast amounts and the maintenance and repair schedule are comparable to other CNG stations of similar age and usage.

8 Response:

9 The forecast O&M expenditure for the Langford Fueling Station is \$60 thousand per year over 10 the next five years. This forecast is based on the history of the station, the projected equipment 11 run hours, and expected electricity consumption. The estimated \$60 thousand per year consists 12 of an average of \$50 thousand for preventative maintenance and repair and \$10 thousand for 13 electricity costs. The average preventative maintenance and repair from 2014 to 2020 was 14 approximately \$40 thousand per year (excluding unplanned upgrades/maintenance). FEI 15 forecasts an incremental \$10 thousand per year on average due to the preventative 16 maintenance and repair schedule over the next five years. FEI expects to complete three major 17 servicing requirements for the compressors during this five year period. Additional station components such as actuator valves, relief valves, and transducers are also expected to reach 18 19 their end of service life during the five-year period. When possible, these components will be 20 replaced or recertified in years that major compressor servicing is not taking place to reduce 21 annual fluctuations in preventative maintenance and repair expenditures.

FEI compared the Langford Fueling Station O&M forecast with other FEI CNG stations to determine the forecast. The average O&M actual expenditures at other FEI CNG stations operating for at least 3 years have a range between \$34 thousand and \$71 thousand per year. The Langford Fueling Station forecast annual average O&M expenditure of \$60 thousand is within the range of other CNG stations. In considering the forecast, five variables were compared between the Langford Fueling Station and other FEI CNG stations: location, type, size, usage, and age.

- 29 The location of the Langford Fueling Station makes it more costly in Location: comparison to other FEI CNG stations. The Langford Fueling Station is one of two FEI 30 CNG stations located on Vancouver Island. A small inventory of spare parts are stored 31 32 on Vancouver Island; however, infrequently replaced items must either be couriered 33 from FEI's Port Kells CNG spare parts storage facility or substituted for locally sourced 34 parts that are often more expensive when available. Furthermore, there was not an 35 established network of trained CNG technicians when the Langford Fueling station was 36 commissioned in 2014. Vancouver Island CNG technicians were trained to perform 37 routine preventative maintenance and troubleshoot priority service call issues. Major 38 servicing and more complicated preventative maintenance requires the travel or remote 39 assistance of expert CNG technicians.
- **Type:** The Langford Fueling Station is fast fill only, making it more expensive to operate than a similarly sized time fill only station, but less expensive than a similarly sized



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 19

station with both time fill and fast fill capabilities. Compressors start and stop more frequently at fast fill stations resulting in increased valve cycling and wear and tear. Fast fill stations also require additional or more complex equipment such as a point of sales system, storage, priority panel, and fast fill dispenser. Customer requirements for relatively quick on demand 24/7 service make fast fill stations more prone to time sensitive priority service calls when dispensers are inoperable.

- Size: The Langford Fueling Station is mid-tier sized in extent of compression equipment relative to other FEI CNG stations. Dispensing is limited to three fast fill refueling locations, reducing O&M expenditure relative to other FEI CNG stations with up to 102 refueling locations.
- Usage: The Langford Fueling Station averages four total run hours per day between its two compressors. Based on total run hours, it is in the low to mid operating range in comparison to other FEI CNG stations.
- Age: The Langford Fueling Station was commissioned in 2014 and has nearly 10,000 combined run hours between its two compressors. As a CNG station ages, it approaches service intervals that require overhaul, replacement or recertification of equipment. The station is coming up to several service intervals including three major compressor services scheduled over the next five years. Parts and labour expenditures for service intervals were factored into the forecast O&M and compared with other FEI CNG stations that previously completed similar servicing.
- 21 22

23

- 4.3 Please explain whether it would be appropriate to calculate the O&M Rate based
 on the forecast annual average O&M of the station over the remaining expected
 useful life of the station (i.e. over the next 13 or 20 years) instead of over the next
 five years considering that the hours incurred by the equipment over the next five
 years would impact the maintenance and repair/servicing requirements in the
 subsequent years.
- 30

31 Response:

32 It is more appropriate to calculate the O&M Rate based on the forecast annual average O&M of 33 the station over the term of the agreement for the anchor customer(s), rather than over the 34 remaining expected useful life of the station that is longer than the contract term, for three 35 primary reasons:

It provides more certainty around the factors taken into account in the O&M forecast,
 such as committed minimum volumes over the contracted term. This allows FEI to
 determine the appropriate schedule and costs anticipated for planned preventative
 maintenance and repairs based on the committed minimum volumes;



Calculating the forecast costs over the contract term is consistent with how FEI calculates rates for all its other CNG fueling stations; and

3. It aligns costs and rates for customers that use the station over the contact term. This
allows costs, forecast to be incurred over the contract term, to be recovered from the
contracted customers that use the stations during the contact term. It would not be
appropriate to set O&M rates based on forecast O&M costs outside of the contract term
when it is unknown to FEI if the current contracted customers will continue to use the
station beyond the contract term.

Although the run hours of the equipment is a factor when forecasting O&M expenditures, other
factors and variables such station load and the overall condition of the equipment affect FEI's
ability to accurately forecast O&M expenditures to reflect actual expenditures over the longerterm.

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 164.4Please confirm, or explain otherwise, that FEI expects annual operating17expenses beyond the next five years to continue on average at \$60,000 (plus18inflation).
- 194.4.1If confirmed, please explain why considering that preventative20maintenance and repair/servicing requirements would likely continue to21increase as more hours are incurred by the equipment and costs would22increase as warranties continue to expire.
- 234.4.2If not confirmed, please provide the expected annual average operating24expenses over the remaining expected useful life of the station and25recalculate the cost of service and the percentage of the cost service26that the proposed fueling rate would recover over the five-year term of27the ColdStar and GFL Fueling Agreements. As part of the response,28please include the financial schedules with the recalculated cost of29service.

31 **Response:**

30

FEI confirms that it expects annual operating expenses beyond the next five years to continue
 on average at \$60 thousand plus inflation. FEI has based this expectation on the following
 three main assumptions and factors.

 FEI has assumed that the volume/load requirements of the station remain consistent with current levels for the remainder of the equipment lifecycle and no station expansion occurs.



- FEI has accounted for the fact that major components of the station's equipment are no
 longer covered by manufacturer's warranty. For example, the compressors are a critical
 component to the fueling station which can have a material impact on O&M expenditures
 if unplanned repairs or replacement become necessary.
- 5 3. FEI has also factored into its expected annual operating expenses the service life of the equipment at the fueling station. FEI employs operating practices to maximize service
 7 life and minimize unplanned component failures by balancing equipment use where possible. For example, FEI staggers station run hours between the compressors to maintain consistency for service intervals and to balance wear and tear in an effort to avoid unplanned repairs, maintenance or service disruptions. This practice helps to reduce the potential for substantial annual fluctuations in O&M expenditures.

Based on the fueling station's current utilization and planned major service intervals for the compressors and other major station components, FEI expects O&M expenditures to be incurred fairly consistently over the remaining useful life of the station.

15 It is important to note, however, that there are three other primary variables that can impact 16 FEI's expectation of annual operating expenses. These three variables, as discussed in more 17 detail below, are station usage, critical component failure, and availability of replacement 18 components. Significant changes to one or more of these three variables may require FEI to re-19 evaluate or update its forecast for O&M expenditures over the remaining useful life of the 20 station. The extent to which these variables may have an impact on a particular fueling station, 21 and the significance of that impact, is difficult to both quantify and predict over the lifecycle of 22 the station.

- Station Usage a significant increase or decrease in customer usage/load would affect the frequency of load cycles on high pressure components. For example, heat exchangers see both pressure and temperature swings during normal operation and are subject to fatigue with increased utilization. Under higher use conditions, components such as these will require refurbishment or replacement in order to maintain safe operation that extends beyond the typical compressor service intervals.
- 2. Critical Component Failure as the station equipment ages, critical components and hardware may require unplanned or unexpected major service, repair or replacement.
- 3. Availability of Replacement Components over time, some components or replacement parts may become unavailable or be difficult to source. To the extent that alternate or substitute components can be used, additional expenses may be incurred to modify or alter the station to facilitate installation.
- 35
- 36
- 37



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 22

- 14.5Please confirm, or explain otherwise, that the O&M Rate in the Original Fueling2Agreement was designed to recover the average forecast O&M expense over the3estimated useful life of the station, such that the O&M Rate would over recover4the expected O&M expenses in the initial years and under recover in the latter5years.
- 6
- 7 8

4.5.1 If not confirmed, please explain how the O&M Rate was designed and provide the rationale for that design. As part of the response, please discuss whether the design could result in intergenerational inequity.

9

10 **Response:**

11 Not confirmed. The O&M Rate in the Original Fueling Agreement was designed to recover the 12 average forecast O&M expense over the five-year term. The O&M Rate in the Original Fueling 13 Agreement was calculated by including FEI's forecast O&M expenditures for operation, 14 anticipated preventative maintenance and repair costs, and electricity costs over the five-year 15 term of the agreement. To design an O&M Rate based on the average O&M over the life of the 16 station would not be reasonable as there are many variables that impact the ability to forecast 17 over the long term useful life of the station. As such, forecasting of O&M expenditures over the 18 term of an agreement creates more accuracy because it is based on more known variables 19 such as expected CNG fuel volume, station load and the overall condition of the station.

The O&M Rate design does not result in intergenerational inequity because it is based on a forecast of O&M expenditures that takes into consideration the relevant factors, such as committed volume/load, station age/condition, term of the agreement, and FEI's operational experience at the fueling station and other similar fueling stations, thus resulting in a more accurate forecast of O&M expenditures, likely closely reflecting the actual O&M expenditures incurred.



No. 1

1 5.0 Reference: **PROPOSED RATES**

2 3

Exhibit B-1, Appendix D, Schedules 1, 2; Exhibit A2-1, ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application, Appendix B, Schedules 1, 2

4

5

6

7

Cost of service model – O&M and property taxes

In Schedule 1 of Appendix D to the Application, FEI forecasts property taxes of \$2,000 in 2021. In Schedule 1 of Appendix B to the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application, FEI forecasts property taxes of \$6,000 for 2021.

- 8 Please explain why property taxes are forecast to decrease by two-thirds for 5.1 9 2021 in the Application compared to the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application. If 10 there has been a change in forecasting methodology, please elaborate and 11 provide the rationale for the change.
- 12

13 Response:

14 There has not been a change in the forecasting methodology FEI uses for property taxes. The 15 reason that property taxes are forecast to decrease in the Application is as a result of a property 16 tax error in the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application, which was discussed in the response to

17 BCUC IR1 8.3 in the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application, which stated the following:

18 The Cold Star cost of service model was adapted from a cost of service model 19 being used to evaluate a project in Nanaimo. While adapting the model for Cold 20 Star, FEVI did not update the property tax rate to that of the City of Langford; this 21 was an oversight. The property tax rate within the model of 5.4996% is higher than the property tax rate that FEVI will pay to the City of Langford. The 2013 22 23 Langford property tax rate for FEVI is 2.5389%. Changing the tax rate in the cost 24 of service model would lower the Cold Star fueling rate by \$0.175 which would be 25 a decrease of 1.6%.

26 BCUC Order G-187-13 approved the station rates for Langford in the original ColdStar-Langford 27 2013 Application which did not include any changes to the property tax rate as discussed in 28 BCUC IR1 8.3 of the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application.

29 Additionally, at the time of responding to this question, FEI determined that the property tax rate 30 used in the current Application is incorrect, which should be 1.95 percent for the Langford site, 31 rather than the 1.62 percent which is more reflective of a Lower Mainland property tax rate. 32 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 3.1 for further discussion on the associated rate 33 impact as a result of this increase to the property tax rate.

- 34
- 35
- 36



1 2

3

5.2 Please provide the actual annual property taxes for the Langford Fueling Station for the years 2014 to 2020.

4 Response:

5 The Langford Fueling Station is located at FEI's Langford Regional Operations Facility. 6 Property taxes for the Langford CNG Fueling Station are not separated from taxes for the 7 Langford Regional Operations Facility, as the station is not located on a separate parcel. 8 Please refer to the table below for the total property taxes paid for the property at the Langford 9 Regional Operations Facility from 2014-2020 and the amount of property tax FEI had included in the cost of service model of the Langford Fueling Station from 2014 to 2020 (i.e. recovered as 10 11 part of the station capital rate). The property tax amounts used in the model are the local 12 property tax rates multiplied by the value of the foundation of the station. This approach to 13 assessing the property tax is consistent with how FEI has assessed property tax on all of its 14 CNG stations; it serves as a reasonable approximation of the total property tax attributable to 15 the Langford Fueling Station.

Langford Office Property Taxes 2014 to 2020

Folio	Year	Total Property Taxes	Total Amount Attributed to the Langford CNG Station
327-06500-190	2020	303,240	6,124
327-06500-190	2019	341,574	6,001
327-06500-190	2018	319,008	5,881
327-06500-190	2017	318,687	5,763
327-06500-190	2016	294,458	5,646
327-06500-190	2015	280,206	5,533
327-06500-190	2014	276,151	5,421

16

- 17
- 18
- 19 20

21

22

23

In Schedule 2 of Appendix B to the ColdStar-Langford 2013 Application, FEI forecasts fees and administration costs of \$2,000 for 2021. In Schedule 2 of Appendix D to the Application, there is no line item for fees and administration costs.

- 5.3 Please explain why the Application does not include a forecast for fees and administration costs.
- 24 25



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 25

1 Response:

- 2 FEI no longer breaks out the fees and administration costs in Schedule 2 of the financial
- schedules. All related O&M expenses are included as one line item in Schedule 2, which is
 consistent with the approach FEI has taken in all of its recent CNG station rate applications.
- 5



9

No. 1

1 6.0 Reference: **APPROVALS SOUGHT**

- 2 Exhibit B-1, p. 2; Exhibit A2-2, FEI CNG and Liquified Natural Gas 3 (LNG) Agreement Rates – 2019 Annual Report (CNG and LNG 2019 4 Annual Report), dated February 27, 2020, p. 6; Exhibit A2-3, 5 Application for Approval to Amend the Capital Rate for the Vedder 6 Transport Ltd. (Vedder) LNG Fueling Station Established in the Third 7 Amending Agreement between FEI and Vedder (Vedder 2017 Application), dated January 27, 2017, p. 3 8
 - Third party fueling agreements
- On page 2 of the Application, FEI states: 10
- 11 Further, as a result of GFL's acquisition of the solid waste business of Evergreen 12 Industries Ltd. (Evergreen) on Vancouver Island, GFL has requested that 13 Evergreen's existing third party fueling agreement for the Langford Fueling 14 Station (filed with the BCUC under Tariff Supplement J-13) be terminated. For 15 administrative efficiency and consolidated billing, GFL is assuming Evergreen's 16 minimum annual quantity commitment of 500 GJs per year within GFL's new five-17 year Fueling Services Agreement. GFL has made the termination of the service agreement with Evergreen a condition to its execution of the new five-year 18 19 agreement. A copy of a letter from GFL is provided in Appendix B to support this request for termination of the Evergreen agreement. 20
- 21 On page 9 of the Application, FEI states:
- 22 If approved, FEI would apply the revised rates for the Langford Fueling Station to 23 new third party agreements executed on or after January 1, 2021, which would 24 be filed with the BCUC for approval. Existing third party customers will continue 25 to obtain service from the Langford Fueling Station under the terms and rates 26 established in their respective agreements approved by the BCUC until expiry or 27 termination.
- 28 6.1 Please confirm, or explain otherwise, that the initial term of Evergreen's existing 29 third-party fueling agreement for the Langford Fueling Station (Evergreen 30 Agreement) ends on January 11, 2022.
- 31

32 **Response:**

- 33 Confirmed.
- 34
- 35
- 36



Please confirm, or explain otherwise, that upon expiry of the initial term of an

existing third-party fueling agreement at the Langford Fueling Station, that

customer can execute a new third-party fueling agreement under the proposed

rates for the station without incurring any termination fees or penalties.

2 3

1

- 4
- 5 6
- <u>Response:</u>

6.2

- 7 Confirmed.
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11 On page 6 of the CNG and LNG 2019 Annual Report, FEI states:
- 12 Depending on the terms of the third party agreement, a Short Term Charge 13 and/or a Spot Charge may also be applicable. The Short Term Charge is applied 14 to third party agreements with a term that is less than three years in length, while 15 the Spot Charge is applied to third party agreements, which do not have a minimum firm volume commitment. The Short Term Charge and Spot Charge are 16 17 designed to encourage third party customers to commit to longer terms and firm 18 volumes. With the exception of customers who fuel at the Vedder Fueling 19 Station, all third party customers pay the same Capital and O&M rate as that of 20 the Host fueling station.
- 6.3 Please discuss whether recovering less per GJ toward the capital and operating
 costs of the Langford Fueling Station from customers with new third-party
 agreements compared to customers with existing third-party agreements could
 be considered unduly discriminatory or unduly preferential for the same fueling
 service.

27 Response:

26

Upon further reflection, FEI acknowledges that charging new third-party agreement customers a rate that differs from existing third-party agreement customers at the Langford Fueling Station that receive the same fueling service, as initially proposed in Section 3.3 of the Application, could be considered unduly discriminatory or unduly preferential.

As a result, FEI now proposes that FEI would apply the existing third-party agreement rates to any new third-party agreements at the Langford Fueling Station as that is a more fair and reasonable approach for third-party customers receiving the same fueling service from the same fueling station.

Further, in future cases where the anchor customer's fueling rates differ from existing third-party agreement rates, FEI will use the same approach by applying the existing third-party agreement rates to all new third-party agreements at that same fueling station. This approach is also consistent with that which was proposed by FEI for the Vedder Abbotsford Fueling Station



	application, ⁴ approved by BCUC Order G-87-17 and the recent new third-party proved by Order G-23-20 for the same station.
6.4	Considering that the Short Term Charge and Spot Charge are not applicable to Host or Anchor customers, such as ColdStar and GFL, and as such these customers' fueling rates are already lower than third-party customers who either do not have a long-term fueling agreement or a minimum firm volume commitment, please discuss whether the lower Capital Rate and O&M Rate proposed could result in an unduly discriminatory or unduly preferential fueling rate when compared to the existing third party customers' fueling rates.
Response:	
Please refer to	o the response to BCUC IR1 6.3.
On pa	ge 3 of the Vedder 2017 Application, FEI states:
	The amendment to Vedder's capital rate will not impact the capital rate applied to all third party customers with existing contracts who fuel at the Vedder Abbotsford station. Specifically, Westcan Bulk Transport, Denwill Enterprises Inc., Ledcor Resources and Transportation L.P. and Clark Reefer Lines Ltd. will continue to pay the agreed upon capital rate of \$1.927 as per their respective Fueling Service Agreements until their individual expiry dates. Additionally, any new third party customers that could receive fueling service from the Vedder Abbotsford station will pay the same capital rate that is currently paid by the existing third party customers.
6.5	Please explain why customers with new third-party agreements at the Langford Fueling Station should be applied the revised rates given that customers with new third-party agreements at the Vedder Abbotsford Station are applied the unrevised rates (i.e. the same rate as the existing third-party customers of that
	agreement ap 6.4 Response: Please refer to On par

⁴ Application dated January 27, 2017.



TM	FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) Application for Approval of Revised/Renewal Rates for the Langford Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Fueling Station under the GGRR (Application)	Submission Date: February 25, 2021
	Response to British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 29

 Abbotsford Station could be considered unduly discriminatory or unduly preferential. Why or why not?
 3

4 <u>Response:</u>

5 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 6.3.

Attachment 3.2

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Revenue Requirement

Schedule 1 (\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line	Particulars	Reference	<u>2021</u>	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	<u>2027</u>	2028	<u>2029</u>	2030	<u>2031</u>	<u>2032</u>	<u>2033</u>
1	Revenue Requirement		_												
2	Cost of Energy Sold		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Operation and Maintenance	Schedule 2, Line 18	60	61	62	64	65	66	68	69	70	72	73	75	76
4	Property Taxes	Schedule 2, Line 23	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
5	Depreciation Expense	Schedule 8, Line 13 + Line 30	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
6	Amortization Expense	Schedule 9, Line 46	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Other Revenue	Schedule 2, Line 19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Income Taxes	Schedule 3, Line 20	12	15	17	19	20	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	20
9	Earned Return	Schedule 5, Line 23	49	46	42	38	35	31	27	24	20	17	13	9	6
10															
11	Annual Revenue Requirement	Sum of Lines 2 through 9	183	184	183	183	181	178	176	174	172	170	168	165	163
12	-	-													

13 Calendar Year = Contract Year

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: O&M, Other Revenue and Property Tax

Schedule 2

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line	Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	Gross O&M		-												
2	Labour Costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Vehicle Costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Employee Expenses		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Materials & Supplies		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Computer Costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Lease Cost		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Contractor Costs		60	61	62	64	65	66	68	69	70	72	73	75	76
9	Electricity		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Recoveries & Revenue		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11															
12	Non-Labour Costs		60	61	62	64	65	66	68	69	70	72	73	75	76
13															
14	Total Gross O&M Expenses		60	61	62	64	65	66	68	69	70	72	73	75	76
15	·														
16	(Less): Capitalized Overhead		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Add (Less): Adjustment		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	Net O&M		60	61	62	64	65	66	68	69	70	72	73	75	76
19															
20	Property Taxes														
21	General, School and Other		2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	1% in Lieu of General Municipal Tax ¹		_	-	_	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22		Schedule 10, Line 57/1000 x 1%	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>							
23	Total Property Taxes		2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
24															

 24

 25
 1 - Calculation is based on the second preceeding year; ex., 2023 is based on 2021 revenue

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Income Tax Expense

Schedule 3 (\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line	Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	Income Tax Expense														
2															
3	Earned Return	Schedule 5, Line 23	49	46	42	38	35	31	27	24	20	17	13	9	6
4	Deduct: Interest on debt	Schedule 5, Line 22	(23)	(21)	(19)	(18)	(16)	(14)	(13)	(11)	(9)	(8)	(6)	(4)	(3)
5	Add (Deduct): Amortization Expense	Schedule 9, Line 46	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Add: Depreciation Expense	Schedule 8, Line 13 + Line 30	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58
7	Add: Removal Cost Provision		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Deduct: Overhead Capitalized Expensed for Tax Purpose	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Deduct Removal Costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Deduct: Capital Cost Allowance	Schedule 4, Line 22	(54)	(44)	(36)	(29)	(24)	(20)	(16)	(14)	(11)	(10)	(8)	(7)	(6)
11	Taxable Income After Tax	Sum of Lines 3 through 10	32	40	46	51	54	55	56	57	57	57	57	56	55
12															
13	Income Tax Rate		27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%	27%
14	1 - Current Income Tax Rate	1 - Line 13	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%	73%
15															
16	Taxable Income	Line 11 / Line 14	44	55	64	70	74	75	77	78	79	78	78	77	75
17															
18	Total Income Tax Expense	Line 16 x Line 13	12	15	17	19	20	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	20
19	Adjustments		-	-	-		-	-				-	-	-	-
20	Net Tax Expense	Line 18 + Line 19	12	15	17	19	20	20	21	21	21	21	21	21	20

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Capital Cost Allowance

Schedule 4

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line	e Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill	posts)- Class 8 @ 20%													
2	Opening Balance	Preceeding Year, Line 5	234	187	150	120	96	77	61	49	39	31	25	20	16
3	Additions	Schedule 7 , Line 10 - AFUDC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	CCA	[Line 2 + (Line 3 x 1/2)] x CCA Rate	(47)	(37)	(30)	(24)	(19)	(15)	(12)	(10)	(8)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)
5	Closing Balance	Sum of Lines 2 through 4	187	150	120	96	77	61	49	39	31	25	20	16	13
6															
7	CNG Foundations- Class 1 @ 4%														
8	Opening Balance	Preceeding Year, Line 11	109	105	101	97	93	89	85	82	79	76	73	70	67
9	Additions	Schedule 7 , Line 11 - AFUDC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	CCA	[Line 8 + (Line 9 x 1/2)] x CCA Rate	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
11	Closing Balance	Sum of Lines 8 through 10	105	101	97	93	89	85	82	79	76	73	70	67	64
12															
13	CNG Dehydrator- Class 8 @ 20%														
14	Opening Balance	Preceeding Year, Line 17	13	10	8	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1
15	Additions	Schedule 7 , Line 12 - AFUDC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	CCA	[Line 14 + (Line 15 x 1/2)] x CCA Rate	(3)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
17	Closing Balance	Sum of Lines 14 through 16	10	8	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1
18															
19	Total CCA														
20	Opening Balance	Preceeding Year, Line 23	355	302	258	223	194	170	150	134	120	109	99	91	84
21	Additions	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	CCA	2	(54)	(44)	(36)	(29)	(24)	(20)	(16)	(14)	(11)	(10)	(8)	(7)	(6)
23	Closing Balance	Sum of Lines 20 through 22	302	258	223	194	170	150	134	120	109	99	91	84	78
~ *															

24 1 - Schedule 4 , Sum of detailed Additions lines

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Rate Base

Schedule 5

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Lin	e Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	<u>2024</u>	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	<u>2033</u>
1	Rate Base														
2	Gross Plant In Service- Beginning	Schedule 7, Line 7	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
3	Gross Plant In Service- Ending	Schedule 7, Line 25	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
4															
5	Accumulated Depreciation- Beginning	Schedule 8, Line 7	(345)	(403)	(461)	(519)	(577)	(635)	(692)	(750)	(808)	(866)	(924)	(982)	(1,040)
6	Accumulated Depreciation- Ending	Schedule 8, Line 25	(403)	(461)	(519)	(577)	(635)	(692)	(750)	(808)	(866)	(924)	(982)	(1,040)	(1,098)
7															
8	Contributions in Aid of Construction- Beginning	Schedule 7, Line 29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Contributions in Aid of Construction- Ending	Schedule 7, Line 32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10															
11	Accumulated Amortization- Beginning	Schedule 8, Line 29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	Accumulated Amortization- Ending	Schedule 8, Line 32	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-
13															
14	Net Plant in Service, Mid-Year	Sum (Lines 2 through 12)/2	784	726	668	610	552	494	436	378	320	263	205	147	89
15															
16	Unamortized Deferred Charges, Mid-Year	Schedule 9, Line 49	3	5	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Cash Working Capital	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
18	Total Rate Base	Sum of Lines 14 through 17	788	733	673	614	555	496	438	380	322	264	207	149	91
19															
20	Return on Rate Base														
21	Equity Return	Line 18 x ROE x Equity %	27	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	11	9	7	5	3
22	Debt Component	2	23	21	19	18	16	14	13	11	9	8	6	4	3
23	Total Earned Return	Line 21 + Line 22	49	46	42	38	35	31	27	24	20	17	13	9	6
24	Return on Rate Base %	Line 23 / Line 18	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%	6.25%
25															

25 26 1 - Schedule 7, Line 25 x FEI CWC/Closing GPIS %

27 2 - Line 18 x (LTD Rate x LTD% + STD Rate x STD %)

FortisBC Energy Inc. Langford CNG Station

December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Capital Spending

Schedule 6

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Lin	e Particulars	Reference	<u>2021</u>	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	Capital Spending Prior to 2021		-												
2	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts)		-												
3	CNG Foundations		-												
4	CNG Dehydrator														
5	Total Capital Spending Prior to 2021	Sum of Lines 2 through 4	-												
6															
7	AFUDC Prior to 2021														
8	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts)		-												
9	CNG Foundations		-												
10	CNG Dehydrator														
11	Total AFUDC Prior to 2021	Sum of Lines 8 through 10	-												
12															
13	Capital Spending 2021 Onwards														
14	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	CNG Foundations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	CNG Dehydrator														
17	Total Capital Spending 2021 Onwards	Sum of Lines 14 through 16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18															
19	Total Capital Spending ¹	Line 5 + Line 17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Total AFUDC	Line 11 + Line 18													
21	Total Annual Capital Spending and AFUDC	Line 19 + Line 20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22															
23	Contributions in Aid of Construction		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	Removal Costs														
25	Net Annual Project Costs- Capital	Line 21 + 23 + 24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26															
27	Total Project Costs- Capital Spending and AFUDC	Sum of Line 21	-												
28	Total Net Project Costs- including CIAC & Removal Costs	Sum of Line 25	-												
29															
30	 Excluding capitalized overhead: First year of analysis includes all prior year 	ear spending													

30 1 - Excluding capitalized overhead; First year of analysis includes all prior year spending

FortisBC Energy Inc. Langford CNG Station

December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Gross Plant in Service & Contributions in Aid of Construction

Schedule 7

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Lin	e Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	Gross Plant in Service														
2															
3	Gross Plant in Service, Beginning														
4	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill	pos Preceeding Year, Line 22	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962
5	CNG Foundations	Preceeding Year, Line 23	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142
6	CNG Dehydrator	Preceeding Year, Line 24	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
7	Total Gross Plant in Service, Beginning	Sum of Lines 4 through 6	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
8															
9	Gross Plant in Service, Additions														
10	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill	00! Schedule 6, Lines 2 + 8 + 14 + 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	CNG Foundations	Schedule 6, Lines 3 + 9 + 15 + 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	CNG Dehydrator	Schedule 6, Lines 4 + 10 + 16 + 18	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-		
13	Total Gross Plant in Service, Additions	Sum of Lines 10 through 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14															
15	Gross Plant in Service, Retirements														
16	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill	posts)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	CNG Foundations		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	CNG Dehydrator		-					-	-						
19	Total Gross Plant in Service, Retirements	Sum of Lines 16 through 18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20															
21	Gross Plant in Service, Ending														
22	CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill	00! Line 4 + Line 10 + Line 16	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962	962
23	CNG Foundations	Line 5 + Line 11 + Line 17	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142
24	CNG Dehydrator	Line 6 + Line 12 + Line 18	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
25	Total Gross Plant in Service, Ending	Sum of Lines 22 through 24	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
26															
27															
28	Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC)														
29	CIAC, Beginning		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	Additions		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Retirements		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
32	CIAC, Ending	Sum of Lines 29 through 31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Accumulated Depreciation & Amortization

Schedule 8 (\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line Particulars Reference <u>2021</u> <u>2022</u> <u>2023</u> <u>2024</u> <u>2025</u> <u>2026</u> <u>2027</u> <u>2028</u> <u>2029</u> <u>2030</u> <u>2031</u> <u>2032</u> <u>2033</u> 1 Accumulated Depreciation 2 3 Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts) Preceeding Year, Line 22 (287) (335) (383) (719) (816) (864) 4 (431) (479) (527) (575) (623) (671) (768) CNG Foundations Preceeding Year, Line 23 (43) (64) (71) (78) (92) (107) (121) (128) 5 (50) (57) (85) (99) (114) CNG Dehydrator Preceeding Year, Line 24 6 (16) (19) (21) (24) (27) (29) (32) (35) (37) (40) (43) (45) (48) Total Accumulated Depreciation, Beginning Sum of Lines 4 through 6 7 (345) (403) (461) (519) (577) (635) (692) (750) (808) (866) (924) (982) (1,040) 8 9 Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense¹ Schedule 7. Line 4 & Line 10 (48) 10 CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts)@ 5% (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) (48) 11 CNG Foundations@ 5% Schedule 7, Line 5 & Line 11 (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) 12 CNG Dehydrator@ 5% Schedule 7, Line 6 & Line 12 (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) 13 Total Accumulated Depreciation, Depreciation Expense Sum of Lines 10 through 12 (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) (58) 14 15 Accumulated Depreciation, Retirements 16 CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts) Schedule 7, Line 16 -----Schedule 7, Line 17 17 CNG Foundations -18 CNG Dehydrator Schedule 7, Line 18 Total Accumulated Depreciation, Retirements 19 Sum of Lines 16 through 18 20 21 Accumulated Depreciation, Ending 22 CNG Dispensing Equipment (hoses and fill posts) Line 4 + Line 10 + Line 16 (335) (383) (431) (479) (527) (575) (623) (671) (719) (768) (816) (864) (912) 23 **CNG** Foundations Line 5 + Line 11 + Line 17 (50) (57) (64) (71) (78) (85) (92) (99) (107) (114) (121) (128) (135) 24 CNG Dehydrator Line 6 + Line 12 + Line 18 (19) (29) (37) (40) (43) (48) (21) (24) (27) (32) (35) (45) (51) 25 Total Accumulated Depreciation, Ending Sum of Lines 22 through 24 (403) (461) (519) (577) (635) (692) (750) (808) (866) (924) (982) (1,040) (1,098) 26 27 28 Accumulated Amortization of Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC) 29 Accumulated Amortization CIAC, Beginning -------------30 Amortization -------. ---31 Retirements 32 Accumulated Amortization CIAC, Ending Sum of Lines 29 through 31 33

34 1- Depreciation & Amortization Expense calculation is based on opening balance + (additions x in-service days/365 if it is the in-service year for project; otherwise, it is based on the opening balance of the plant-in-service)

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Deferred Charges & Deficiency / Surplus [Tracker]

Schedule 9

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

	Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	<u>2028</u>	2029	2030	<u>2031</u>	2032	2033
1	Deferred Charge- Lease during Construction														
2	Opening Balance	Previous Year, Line 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Gross Additions														
4	Tax	Line 3 x Tax Rate													
5	Net Additions	Sum of Lines 3 through 4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Amortization Expense @ 5 years							-	. <u> </u>	-	-	-			-
7 8	Closing Balance	Lines 2 + 5 + 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Deferred Charge- Application Costs														
10	Opening Balance	Previous Year, Line 15	-	6	4	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	Gross Additions		10												
12	Tax	Line 11 x Tax Rate	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Net Additions	Sum of Lines 11 through 12	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Amortization Expense @ 5 years		(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Closing Balance	Lines 10 + 13 + 14	6	4	3	1		-	-	-	-		-	-	-
16	closing balance	2010 10 10 10	0		5	-									
17	Deficiency / Surplus [Tracker]														
18	Opening Balance	Previous Year, Line 26	-	5	9	10	7	-			-	-	-	-	
19	Gross Addition	Schedule 10, Line 31 / 1000	5	3	0	(3)	(7)	-			-	-	-	-	
20	Tax	56/feadle 10/ 2000	-	-	-	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	Net Addition	Line 19 + Line 20	5	3	0	(3)	(7)	-							
21	AFUDC	Life 19 + Life 20	5	5	0	(5)	(7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22		Line 18 x (Schedule 10, Lines 17 x Line 18)		0	0	0	0								
	Equity	1	-					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	Debt	2	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	Interest Adjustment				<u> </u>		0		- <u></u>						
26	Closing Balance	Sum of Lines 21 through 25	5	9	10	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27															
28															
29	Deferred Charge- Non Rate Base														
30	Opening Balance	Previous Year, Line 38	-	5	9	10	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Opening Balance, Adjustment	Opening balance transfer to rate base	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	Gross Additions		5	3	0	(3)	(7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	Tax		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	AFUDC			0	0	1	0	-	. <u> </u>		-	-		-	-
35	Net Additions	Sum of Lines 32 through 34	5	4	1	(3)	(7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	Interest Adjustment		-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Amortization Expense		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	Closing Balance	Lines 30 + 31 + 35 + 36 + 37	5	9	10	7	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39															
40	Deferred Charge- Rate Base														
41	Opening Balance	Previous Year, Line 47	-	6	4	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	Opening Balance, Adjustment	·		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	Gross Additions		10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	Tax		(3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	Net Additions		7				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	Amortization Expense		(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	Closing Balance	Lines 41 + 45 + 46	(<u>+</u> /	4	3	1	(1)		·						
47 48	Closing Ddidille	LINC3 41 7 40 7 40	0	4	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48 49	Deferred Charge, Mid-Year	(Line 41 + Line 42 + Line 47) / 2	3	5	4	2	1								
	Derenieu Clidige, Ivilu-Tedi	(LINC 41 T LINE 42 T LINE 4/) / 2												-	-

51 1- Line 18 x [Schedule 10 , (Lines 20 x 21+ Lines 22 x 23) x (1- Tax Rate)]

52 2- Adjustment to net account to zero in final year; result of varying WACC rates throughout contract

FortisBC Energy Inc. Largiotal CMS Sation December 2020 Largied CMS Station: Contract Rate Design Schedule LJ (5), undes otherwise stated

Particulars Annual Cost of Service (Total) Annual Cost of Service (O&M, excl. lease) Annual Cost of Service (Lease Only) Annual Cost of Service (Incl. leased)	Annual Cost of Service (Incl. lease) Annual Volume (TJ)	% of Annual Revenue Required to be Collected Amnual Revenue Required to be Collected (Incl. Lease) Amnual Revenue Required to be Collected (08M, vec.) (ease) Amnual Revenue Required to be Collected (Lease Orly) PV of Amnual Revenue Required to be Collected (Incl. Lease)	PV of Annual Revenue Required to be Collected (O&M, PV of Annual Revenue Required to be Collected (Lease)	<mark>Annual Discount Rate</mark> Equity Component	ROE % Equity Portion	Debt Component Long Term Debt Rate Long Term Deht Portion	Short Term Debt Rate	Tax Rate	Annual Discount Rate (After-Tax WACC) 1 - ROE % x Equity Portion + [(LTD x LTD	Cost of Service (Include Lease, Exclude O&M Annual Capita Rate Annual Dg'iciency (Surplus); Cost of. Annual Volumetric Capital Rate (S/GJ);	Contract Term Capital Rate Cakulation and Present Value Proof Capital Rate over Contract Term Volume TT	Capital Rate Revenue over Contract Term	Present Value Proof PV of Capital Rate Revenue over Contract Term Sum of Nate Revenue PV Cost to Service over Contract Term PV Cost to Service over Contract Term Difference from required Definery Revenue (Cakulation of Year 1 Capital Rate over Contract Term (e Annual Capital Rate Escalation over Contract Term Annual Escalator over Contract Term Product of Escalators	romua f	where:	Cost of Service (O&M. Excl. Lease) Forecast Annual BC CP (Rate Annual O&M Expense (Excl. Lease) Annual Volumetric O&M Rate (\$/G1)	Fueling Station Rate Capital Rate (S/GJ) O&M Rate (S/GJ)	OH&M Rate (\$/GJ) otal Annual Volumetric Contract Rate (\$/GJ) Annual Forecast Revienue	<mark>isent Value Proof of Total Rever</mark> <i>RR Requirement: 80% of total CC</i> Capital Rate (\$/GJ) O&M Rate (\$/GJ)	Total Amual Volumetric Contract Rate (Capital & OS Amual Volume (TJ) Amual Cost of Service Collected over Contract Term	PV of REVENUE Collected Sum of PV REVENUE Collected over Contract Term PV @ Total Cost of Service (100%) over Contract Te Sum of PV @ 100% Cost of Service over Contract T
(asse)		e Collected liected (Inc.L Lease) liected (IoSM, yez.L Lease) liected (Lease Only) be Collected (Inc.L Lease)	PV of Annual Revenue Required to be Collected (O&M, excl. Lease) PV of Annual Revenue Required to be Collected (Lease)						Annual Discount Rate (After-Tax WACC) 1 - ROE % x Equity Portion + [(LTD x LTD Portion + STD x STD Portion) x (1 - Tax Rate)]	of Service (Include Lease, <u>Evolude O&M)</u> Annual Capital Rate Annual Opticary (Surplus); Cast of Service - Contract Rate Annual Volumetic Capital Rate (SJ SI); COS based Bergond Contract Term	t ion and Present Value Proof M	tract Term	<u>àue Proof</u> Capital Rate Revenue of PV Rate Revenue oro Service over Contract Term Difference from required Délivery Revenue (should be zero)	Gikulation of Year 1 Capital Bitt over Contract Term (excluding OBM) Annal Capital Bitt Escatition over Contract Term Annal Escalator over Contract Term Product of Escalators	$r_1 = \frac{1}{\left[\frac{\sum_n^1 \left(V_n \times (1+E)^{(n-1)}\right)_i}{\sum_n^1 PVCOS}\right]}$	r = Contract Rate Year 1 Valme D = Discount Rate D = Discount Rate E = Annual Nate Scialation percentage PCOS = Present Value of the Cost of Service (excluding Q&M) over Contract Term PCOS = Present Value of the Cost of Service (excluding Q&M) over Contract Term	ase) (S/GJ)		tate (\$/GJ)	ue Required under GGRR 05(incl. 0&M) for the Over Contract Term of the oper	Total Annual Volumetric Contract Rate (Capital & O&M only) Annual Volume [1]) Annual Cost of Service Collected over Contract Term	lv of REVENUE Collected Sum of Pv REVEULE Collected Pv @ Traditions of Severe Contract Term Rev De 2005 Cores of Severe on Schridter Thran frier LOBM)
Reference Schedule 1, Line 11 Schedule 1, Line 3 - Line 3 Schedule 2, Line 7 Lines 1 - Line 2	Line 1 - Line 2 Minimum contract demand	GGRR: 80% during Contract Term, 100% thereafter Line 4 x Line 7 Line 2 x Line 7 Line 3 x Line 7 Line 8 (11 + Line 26)^YY	Line 9/ (1 + Line 26)^Yr Line 10/ (1 + Line 27)^Yr						**	Line 37 during Contract Term, Line 8 thereafter Line 8 - Line 30 Line 30 / Line 5 / 1000	Yr 1 = Line 50; Previous Year rate x Line 47 Line 5	Line 35 x Line 36 x 1000	Line 37 / (1 + Line 26) *Yr Sum of Line 40 Sum of Line 1, fram 3021 (n 2025 Line 41 - Line 42	No escalation year 1; Yf2-> (1 + Line 46) Cumulative Product of Line 47	$\frac{1}{(S_{1}+D)^{n}}$	V = Annual Volume n= Contract Year (excluding O&M) over Contract Term	CPI BC Stats Canada Line 9 Line 61 / Line 5 / 1000	Line 32 Line 62	G-78-13 Sum of Line 66 to Line 68 Line 5 v Jine 641 v 1000	Present Value Proof of Total Revenue Required under GGR GGR Requirement: 201-of proof COS/Incl. O&M (Jur the Our Contract Term of the operation recovered under take-ex-pay agreement (contract demand) with a minimum Cost Require (SCI) Cost Res (SCI) OBM Res (SCI) 2018 For SCI Proof COS (Find COS) (SCI) (SCI	Line 74 + Line 75 Minimum contract demand (Line 76 x Line 77) x 1000	Line 78 / (1 + Line 26) ^Yr Sum of Line 80 (Line 1 + Line 2)/(1 + Line 9)^Yr Sum of Line 87
2021 182,827 60,000 -	122,827 21.0	80% 98,262 48,000 - 93,165	45,511		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	92,824 5,438 4.420	4.420	92,824	88,009 412,028 412,028	2.00% 100% 100.00%	4.420		2.00% 48,000 2.286	4.420	0.520 7.226 151 744	mand) with a minim 4.420 2.286	6.706 21 140,824	133,520 625,092 173,345 781.364
2022 183,608 61,200 -	122,408 21.0	80% 97,927 48,960 - 88,032	44,013		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	94,680 3,246 4.509	4.509	94,680	85,114	2.00% 102% 102.00%	0.046/		2.00% 48,960 2.331	4.509	0.520 7.360	term of o 4.509 2.331	6.840 21 143,640	129,127 165,057
2023 183,410 62,424 -		80% 96,788 49,939 82,496	42,565		8.75% 38.50%	4.78% 5.0.14%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	96,574 215 4.599	4.599	96,574	82,313	2.00% 102% 104.04%	1		2.00% 49,939 2.378	4.599 2.378	11		6.977 21 146,513	124,878
2024 182,651 63,672 -		80% 95,183 50,938 - 76,920	41,165		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	98,505 1 (3,322) 4.691	4.691	Į.	79,605	2.00% 102% 106.12%			2.00% 50,938 2.426	4.691 2.426	0.520 7.636 160 363		7.116 21 149,443	120,770 1
2025 181,449 64,946 -			39,810		8.75% 38.50%	4.78% 59.14%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	100,475 1 (7,272) 4.785	4.785	100,475	76,986	2.00% 102% 108.24%	0.0423		2.00% 51,957 2.474	4.785 2.474	11		7.259 21 152,432	116,796 139,030
2026 177,954 66,245			48,126		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	111,709 1 - 5.319	. 015	NT7 -		%0 %0			2.00% 66,245 3.155	5.319 3.155	0.520 8.994 188.874			
2027 176,239 67,570 -	21.0	100% 108,669 67,570 - 74,852	46,542		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	108,669 - 5.175	-	7777		0% 0.00%			2.00% 67,570 3.218		0.520 8.912 187 159			
2028 174,311 68,921 -	105,390 21.0	100% 105, 390 68, 921 -	45,011		8.75% 38.50%	4.78%	2.19%	27.00%	5.47%	105,390 - 5.019	012			0% 0% 0.00%			2.00% 68,921 3.282	5.019	0.520 8.821 185 231			
2029 172,218 70,300 -	21.0 21.0	100% 101,918 70,300 -	43,530							101,918 - 4.853									0.520 8.721			

%0 %0 %0000

%0 %00.0

0% 0% 0.00%

0% 0% -

2.00% 76,095 **3.624**

2.00% 74,602 **3.552**

2.00% 73,140 **3.483**

2.00% 71,706 **3.415**

4.132 3.624 0.520 **8.276** 173,787

4.319 3.552 0.520 **8.391** 176,220

4.502 3.483 0.520 **8.505** 178,604

4.681 3.415 0.520 **8.615** 180,919

8.75% 38.50% 4.78% 591.14% 2.19% 2.36% 2.36% 5.47%

8.75% 38.50% 4.78% 59.14% 2.19% 2.19% 2.36% 2.36% 2.36% 2.36% 5.47%

8.75% 38.50% 4.78% 59.14% 2.19% 2.19% 2.36% 2.36% 2.36% 5.47%

8.75% 38.50% 4.78% 59.14% 2.19% 2.36% 2.36% 2.36% 5.47%

2033 162,867 76,095 86,772 21.0 21.0 86,772 86,772 76,095 76,095 76,095 76,095 76,095 76,095 76,095 76,095

2032 165,300 74,602 90,698 21,0 100% 74,602 74,602 74,602 74,602 39,373

2031 167,664 73,140 -94,545 21,0 21,0 100% 94,545 73,140 73,140 73,140 73,140 73,140 73,140

2030 169,999 71,706 -98,293 21,0 100% 98,293 98,293 71,706 42,098

86,772 . **4.132**

90,698 -**4.319**

94,545 -**4.502**

98,293 -**4.681**

-21.0

-21.0 -

21.0

21.0

Langford CNG Station December 2020

Langford CNG Station: Discounted Cash Flow Analysis

Schedule 11 (\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line	Particulars	Reference	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033
1	Cash Flow														
2	Add: Revenue	Schedule 10, (Line 66 + Line 67) x Line 5 / Line 7	176	180	183	187	191	178	176	174	172	170	168	165	163
3	Less: O&M, Property Tax Expense	Schedule 1, - (Line 3 + Line 4)	(62)	(64)	(65)	(66)	(67)	(69)	(70)	(72)	(73)	(74)	(76)	(77)	(79)
4	EBITDA ¹	Line 2 + Line 3	114	116	118	121	123	109	106	103	99	96	92	88	84
5	Capital Expenditures ²	Schedule 6, Line 19 + Line 23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Pre-Tax Cash Flow	Line 4 + Line 5	114	116	118	121	123	109	106	103	99	96	92	88	84
7	Income Tax Expense	Line 4 x (- Schedule 3, Line 13)	(31)	(31)	(32)	(33)	(33)	(29)	(29)	(28)	(27)	(26)	(25)	(24)	(23)
8	Overhead Capitalized Tax Shield	Schedule 3, -Line 8 x Line 13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	CCA Tax Shield / Removal Cost	Schedule 3, (-Line 9 + Line 10) x Schedule 3, Line 13	14	12	10	8	6	5	4	4	3	3	2	2	2
10	Terminal Value of CCA Tax Shield	4		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	Terminal Value	5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
12															
13	Free Cash Flow	Sum of Line 6 to Line 11	97	96	96	96	96	85	82	79	76	72	69	66	63
14															
15	After Tax WACC %	Schedule , Line 17	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%	5.47%
16	Present Value of Free Cash Flow ³	Line 13 / (1 + Line 15)^Yr	92	87	82	78	74	62	56	51	47	42	39	35	31
17	Total Present Value of Free Cash Flow	Sum of Line 16	776												
18															

19 1 - Earnings Before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation & Amortization (EBITDA)

20 2 - Net of CIAC and removal costs (if applicable) and excludes capitalized overhead

21 3 - 2021 present value calculates capital expenditure to occur at time zero

22 4 - [Class 8 UCC Closing Balance x CCA Rate / (CCA Rate + WACC) + Class 1.3 UCC Closing Balance x CCA Rate / (CCA Rate + WACC)] x Income Tax Rate

23 5 - Evaluation period reflects the useful life of the assets, therefore it is assumed that the terminal value is zero

FortisBC Energy Inc. Langford CNG Station

December 2020

Langford CNG Station : Approximate Contract Termination Fee Schedule 12

(\$000's), unless otherwise stated

Line Particulars Reference		2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	
1	Total Gross Plant in Service, Ending	Schedule 7, Line 25	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158	1,158
2	Accumulated Depreciation, Ending	Schedule 8, Line 25	(403)	(461)	(519)	(577)	(635)	(692)	(750)	(808)	(866)	(924)	(982)	(1,040)	(1,098)
3	Contributions in Aid of Construction- Ending	Schedule 5, Line 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Accumulated Amortization- Ending	Schedule 5, Line 12	-			-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Deferral Account Repayment	Schedule 9, Line 10	5	9	10	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Add: Removal Costs ¹														
7	Less: Excess Fueling Station Recoveries ²			-	-	-	-	-	-		-		-		
8	Net Termination before Surcharge Payment ³	Sum of Line 1 to Line 7	760	706	648	588	523	465	407	349	292	234	176	118	60
9	Station Surcharge Contribution	Schedule 9, Line 27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Net Termination after Surcharge Payment ³		760	706	648	588	523	465	407	349	292	234	176	118	60

11

12 1- Actual removal costs to be determined at time of contract termination and will be less the net salvage collected to date

13 2 - Cumulative fueling station recoveries received from volumes in excess of minimum contract demand

14 3 - The forecast early termination fee has been calculated on a year end basis. The actual fee would be determined at the time of contract termination and may be different than the amount shown on Line 10