

**FortisBC Inc. Rate Design and Rates for Electric
Vehicle Direct Current Fast Charging Service
Application ~ Project No. 1598940**

Intervener Written Final Argument

by
Donald Flintoff

Tuesday, March 30, 2021

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Jurisdiction.....	2
2.1. Clean Energy Act.....	2
2.2. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Regulation	2
2.3. What is a Prescribed Undertaking?.....	4
2.4. BCUC Setting of Rates.....	4
2.5. Discrimination.....	5
2.5.1. Rate Schedule 96 – Exemption, Just & Reasonable	6
2.5.2. Levelized Rates & Section 18(2) of the CEA	6
2.5.3. Rate Design Principles	7
2.5.4. Idling Fee	9
Chapter 3. Other Matters.....	10
3.1. Services Inc. (Flo) Tier 2 Support	10
3.2. Metering	11
3.3. Timeline.....	11
Chapter 4. Exhibit A-13 Panel Requests	12
Chapter 5. Conclusions	17
5.1. Levelized Rates	17
5.2. Metering	18
5.3. FLO	18
5.4. Costs Permitted.....	18
5.5. Prescribed Undertaking	18
5.6. Rate Schedule 96 – Exemption	18

Chapter 1.

Introduction

In Order Number G-58-21 [Exhibit A-14], the Panel requests that all interveners address legal interpretations of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Clean Energy) Regulation as part of their final arguments.

Chapter 2.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the BCUC is defined in the Clean Energy Act (CEA) and the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Regulation (GGRR). Once the expenditures are in a class prescribed for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in BC, then the Commission must establish the rates to be applied for the utility to recover its cost in each fiscal year.

2.1. Clean Energy Act

In the CEA Part 5 — Energy Efficiency Measures and Greenhouse Gas Reductions Greenhouse gas reduction, Section 18 states:

18 (1) In this section, "prescribed undertaking" means a project, program, contract or expenditure that is in a class of projects, programs, contracts or expenditures prescribed for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in British Columbia.

(2) In setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking, the commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking.

(3) The commission must not exercise a power under the Utilities Commission Act in a way that would directly or indirectly prevent a public utility referred to in subsection (2) from carrying out a prescribed undertaking.

2.2. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Regulation

In the GGRR, Section 5, it states:

Prescribed undertaking — electric vehicle charging stations

5 (1) In this section:

"eligible charging site" means a site where one or more eligible charging stations are located;

"eligible charging station" means a fast charging station that

- (a) is available for use 24 hours a day by any member of the public,
- (b) does not require users to be members of a charging network, and
- (c) is capable of charging electric vehicles of more than one make;

"fast charging station" means a fixed device capable of charging an electric vehicle using a direct current;

"limited municipality" means a municipality with a population of 9 000 or more;

"site limit", in relation to a limited municipality, means the number calculated by

- (a) dividing the population of the municipality by 9 000, and
- (b) if applicable, rounding the quotient up to the nearest whole number.

(2) A public utility's undertaking that is in a class defined as follows is a prescribed undertaking for the purposes of section 18 of the Act:

(a) the public utility constructs and operates, or purchases and operates, an eligible charging station;

(b) the public utility reasonably expects, on the date the public utility decides to construct or purchase an eligible charging station, that

(i) the station will come into operation by December 31, 2025, and

(ii) if the station will be located in a limited municipality, the number of eligible charging sites in the municipality on the date the station will come into operation will not exceed the site limit for the municipality on that date;

- (c) if an eligible charging station comes into operation on or after January 1, 2022, the station uses or is configured to use the Open Charge Point Protocol.

2.3. What is a Prescribed Undertaking?

GGRR, Section 18(2)(a) clearly defines a prescribed undertaking. However, Section 18(2)(b) is not as clear. The words “reasonably expects” to construct or purchase causes some uncertainty as to the date of eligibility of a charging station is a prescribed undertaking. Can the BCUC determine whether a letter of intent (loi) is a reasonable expectation of an eligible charging station being constructed or purchased and therefore a prescribed undertaking?

As a letter of intent is usually non-binding on the parties, then the reasonable expectation of an eligible charging station being constructed or purchased is weak. A pre-construction services agreement or another form of binding agreement would provide the BCUC with more certainty and the ability to determine the eligibility of a charging station to be a prescribed undertaking.

Therefore, a non-binding letter of intent should not be considered as a reasonable expectation of an eligible charging station being constructed or purchased as a prescribed undertaking. However, a binding letter of intent may be considered as a reasonable expectation of an eligible charging station being constructed or purchased as a prescribed undertaking.

2.4. BCUC Setting of Rates

The CEA states: “the commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking”.

FBC is requesting a leveled rate versus a floating rate (based on actual or forecasted prices). The leveled rates may set the market price of electric energy for any private-sector charging stations in the same region. FBC’s rationale for leveled rates is “The maintenance of a stable rate will encourage the use of the EV technology

while not negatively impacting other customers over the life of the program.”

As the fuel cost ratio¹ of EV to gas vehicles is about 1:4.6, the need to use energy cost to encourage the use of EVs should not be an issue in setting rates.

I do not believe that either rate structure, floating or leveled, will discourage the use of the EV technology considering subsidies already provided by the other various levels of government.

This application is for eligible charging stations and floating rates should not be a deterrent. However, leveled rates will impact the other service providers. Further, the other utility customers will bear the risks of the stations being revenue-neutral and becoming stranded assets in the future.

The floating rate approach may eliminate the Flow-through deferral account method and risks to the existing ratepayers.

2.5. Discrimination

The UCA Part 3 – Regulation of Public Utilities, Section 60 - Setting of rates, establishes the conditions that the Commission must consider when setting the rates. Further, Section 59, Discrimination in rates, also may apply.

After the charging station is determined to be an eligible charging station (a prescribed undertaking), then the Commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking. When it sets the rates, the Commission must determine whether to allow these costs into the rate base or not as requested by FBC.

Further, the Commission must not exercise a power under the Utilities Commission Act in a way that would directly or indirectly prevent a public utility from carrying out a prescribed undertaking.

¹ BC Hydro, comparing fuel costs. <https://electricvehicles.bchydro.com/learn/costs-of-electric-vehicles>

In determining the rates using UCA Section 59 the Commission should set the rates such that they must not be unjust or unreasonable and must not disadvantage others providing service of the same description. By allowing the costs into the rate base², the public utility has gained an advantage over any private-sector group that desires to provide service of the same description.

2.5.1. Rate Schedule 96 – Exemption, Just & Reasonable

Currently, RS 96 states, “The rate for electric vehicle charging will be reviewed on a periodic basis.” However, FBC is also requesting an Order in this proceeding that RS 96 will be exempt from general rate changes unless otherwise directed by the BCUC.” I oppose this exemption as it is unnecessary and may increase our energy footprint. EV owners should be exposed to increases in the cost of energy as are all other drivers and ratepayers. Is it just and reasonable to exempt the small group EV owners from rate increases to the disadvantage of other ratepayers? Will the fixed energy cost lead to increased consumption of energy?

2.5.2. Levelized Rates & Section 18(2) of the CEA

FBC states: Levelized rates are consistent with the requirements of section 18(2) of the CEA but are they? Do levelized rates allow FBC to recover its costs incurred in each fiscal year? It would appear that it may if there is no impact or risk to its other ratepayers at the end of each fiscal year. FBC must therefore make up any losses incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking at the end of each fiscal year without impacting its other ratepayers.

18 (2) In setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking, the commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking.

² FBC’s Final Argument - D. Eligible Charging Stations, and Related Revenues and Expenses, To Be Included in FBC’s Regulated Accounts

2.5.3. Rate Design Principles

FBC states the proposed EV rates are supported by rate design principles.

Principle	FBC Proposal	Comment
1	<p>Recovering the Cost of Service; the aggregate of all customer rates and revenues must be sufficient to recover the utility's total cost of service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FBC has set its EV rates based on recovering the total cost of service. 	<p>As this is a prescribed undertaking under CEA, FBC must set its EV rates based on recovering the total cost of service <u>in each fiscal year</u>. The aggregate of all customers might not apply in this instance.</p>
2	<p>Fair apportionment of costs among customers (appropriate cost recovery should be reflected in rates).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed EV rates recover the total cost of the EV service. • Higher rates for higher power stations are supported by a higher cost of service for those stations 	<p>The proposed EV rates recover the total cost of the EV service <u>in each fiscal year</u>.</p> <p>The use of higher rates for higher power stations is acceptable. This would also support the argument for fluctuating rates instead of the proposed leveled rates.</p>
3	<p>Price signals that encourage efficient use and discourage inefficient use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-based rates encourage efficient use when the charging rate slows down, such as when the state-of-charge increases above 80 percent. Unlike an energy-only rate, a time-based rate provides an incentive for drivers to unplug when the charging rate slows and before the EV reaches 100 percent if they do not require the additional energy. • By setting the EV rates on a per-minute basis and by setting the 50 kW and 100 kW stations on separate rates, FBC has structured the EV rates in a way that discourages inefficient use. 	<p>As there is no kWh measurement available at the moment, For the moment, I support the option of a time-based rate that allows only an 80% battery charge.</p> <p>As the battery capacity decays over years in use, I don't believe that time-based rates discourage the inefficient use of the charging stations. Depending on several external conditions, the EV battery capacity maybe only 75% remaining capacity in year six of its life, not 100%.</p> <p>As FBC has separate rates or 50kW and 100kW stations, why could it not also have fluctuating rates that are periodically adjusted based on the cost of energy rather than a 10-year leveled rate?</p>
4	<p>Customer understanding and acceptance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FBC has achieved this by setting all comparable EV stations to one easy-to-understand leveled rate, regardless of 	<p>As this emulates the current gasoline market, I support this principle of a single rate regardless of site location but not</p>

Principle	FBC Proposal	Comment
	site location. In addition, the structure of the rates is similar to other rates in the EV charging services market, making them easy to understand and accept.	the use of a leveled rate.
5	<p>Practical and cost-effective to implement (sustainable and meet long-term objectives).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A leveled rate is practical and cost-effective in that it is easy to understand and FBC does not need to incur any additional costs associated with tracking and regularly updating the rates. 	<p>A leveled cost-effective rate is easy to understand but is it really practical and contributes to the efficient use of energy?</p> <p>The CEA states that a prescribed undertaking must "...collect sufficient revenue <u>in each fiscal year</u> to enable it to recover its costs incurred...". Hence, the Commission should review the rates vs. costs on an annual basis.</p>
6	<p>Rate stability (customer rate impact should be managed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the EV rates are leveled and exempt from general rate increases, the rates are stable and EV customers won't have to worry about future price fluctuations. 	<p>The EV customers should be exposed to the fluctuating cost of energy to ensure efficient use of energy and to assist in reducing the overall energy footprint within the Province.</p>
7	<p>Revenue stability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leveled EV rate will also help with revenue stability and predictability year over year for FBC as demand will not be negatively impacted by increasing rates that may discourage consumer use of the DCFC stations. The static nature of the EV rate will help stabilize demand and provide improved revenue stability and predictability year over year. 	<p>This predictability in EV rates is not required as once an EV is purchased the EV owners' options are limited for charging. The fluctuating rates will most likely not discourage customer use as the customers are already familiar with fluctuating gasoline prices and have already committed to an EV purchase.</p> <p>If the demand is driven by cheap energy, is this a desirable outcome?</p>
8	<p>Avoidance of undue discrimination (interclass equity must be enhanced and maintained).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed EV rate is designed to recover the total cost of service from EV drivers such that interclass equity is maintained. 	<p>However, the CEA states that a prescribed undertaking must "...collect sufficient revenue <u>in each fiscal year</u> to enable it to recover its costs incurred...". This eliminates discrimination and interclass equity is maintained.</p>

2.5.4. Idling Fee

FBC asserts that idling fees are not necessary to discourage EV owners from occupying a charging station unnecessarily as drivers tend to charge at stations for around 30 minutes and then leave after charging their vehicles. However, conflicts are being reported³. Therefore if one believes the growth in EV sales may exceed the growth in charging stations, then it would be in the public interest (safety) to include an idling fee such that if the drivers do behave as asserted by FBC. The idling fee should be sufficient to encourage good behaviour.

³ <https://bc.ctvnews.ca/mobile/electric-vehicle-drivers-not-immune-to-conflict-at-the-pump-1.4656765?cache=yes&clipId=89926>

Chapter 3.

Other Matters

3.1. Services Inc. (Flo) Tier 2 Support

For issues reported between 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. (Pacific Time) Monday through Friday except for statutory holidays, Tier 1 support is provided within four hours from any reported breakdown or malfunction, with Tier 2 support to be provided within four business days when on-site presence is required. For issues reported from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m., all days including statutory holidays and weekends, Tier 1 support is provided within 24 hours, with Tier 2 support provided within four business days. Unless some other provision is made such as multiple charging stations, four business days of downtime means the station may not available for use 24 hours a day by any member of the public; and therefore is not a prescribed undertaking.

Tier 2 support, within four business days, is unacceptable as this is the time when visitors, vacationers, and shoppers will be driving between interior locations and alternate charging services are limited. This Tier 2 time to restore service may be a deterrent to EV technology and the economy of the interior of BC.

This charging station status is broadcasted via Application Programming Interface (API) to the other commonly used station-finding apps including Plugshare, BC Hydro, Chargepoint, and Greenlots over the internet. However, internet service in the interior may not have the coverage for cellphones as it does in the lower mainland.

To meet the definition of an eligible charging station, '24/7' support may be required for these charging stations to be included as a prescribed undertaking depending on the charging station configuration and the number of charging stations per site that remain operational.

As a limited number of charging stations will be available for the near future, I would support a minimum of Tier 1 service only be provided at this time.

3.2. Metering

Currently, FBC is applying for time-based energy rates since Measurement Canada does not yet have an approved energy meter for use with EV charging equipment. As these kWh meters are already in use in some locations in Europe, FBC should advise the BCUC of developments in this area and the estimated cost of incorporating kW-h meters in its charging equipment.

3.3. Timeline

The cost of service components for the stations consist of power purchase expense, operating and maintenance (O&M), property taxes, depreciation, amortization of CIAC, income taxes and earned return, calculated over 10 years.

However, during these 10 years, the EV industry will most likely be producing EVs with increased ranges and EV commercial vehicles that will require higher battery charging rates and shorter charging times. Europe already is increasing the capacity of its charging stations up to 350 kW.

The rapid changes in EV technology are another reason leveled rates may not be desirable and present an unnecessary risk to the other ratepayers.

Also, there appears to be a major cost increase⁴ being imposed throughout Europe by Ionity. Ionity, Europe's network for high-power-charging of electric vehicles, announced it will raise its charging prices by over 500 percent effective January 31, 2020. At that price, it will be three times more expensive than a Tesla supercharger in Europe. The price increase announced by Ionity is making the fuel cost for electric vehicles higher than that of gasoline- or diesel-powered vehicles in Europe where those fuel costs are double that of the United States.

Hence, the Panel should retain its ability to review the charging station rate structure on an annual basis.

⁴ <https://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/international-issues/europe-s-electric-vehicle-charging-prices-to-increase-substantially/>

Chapter 4.

Exhibit A-13 Panel Requests

By Order G-33-21 dated January 28, 2021, the British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) amended the regulatory timetable for the review of the above-noted Application by FortisBC Inc. (FBC). The regulatory timetable set out in Appendix A of Order G-33-21 provides for one round of written final arguments by FBC and interveners.

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Clean Energy) Regulation (GGRR) was amended on June 22, 2020, by B.C. Reg. 139/2020. The amendment added electric vehicle fast-charging stations as a class of prescribed undertakings in section 5 of the GGRR for section 18 of the Clean Energy Act (CEA).

In reviewing the evidentiary record to date, the Panel in Exhibit A-13 requests that FBC and all interveners address the following legal interpretations as part of their written final arguments:

1. Section 5(1) of the GGRR defines an “eligible charging site” as a site where one or more eligible charging stations are located; “limited municipality” as a municipality with a population of 9,000 or more; and “site limit” as the number calculated by dividing the municipality population by 9,000 and rounding the quotient up to the nearest whole number.

1.1. How should a “site” be interpreted for the purposes of determining a “site limit” within a “limited municipality”?

To be an eligible charging site (having one or more eligible charging stations) within a limited municipality (9,000 or more), the site limit (for the number of charging sites) is the number the population of the municipality divided by 9,000 then rounding the quotient up to the nearest whole number. The site limit applies to the charging sites within the limited municipality, not the number of charging stations.

1.2. For example, should there be any considerations regarding geographic location, location size, or the number of fast-charging stations for a “site”?

Consideration should be given to the location of fast-charging stations for a site. They should be located in an easily noticed geographic location (i.e. main road, or highway in the town). Consideration of location size and number of DCFC stations should be determined by the municipality or regional districts.

1.3. Can multiple electric vehicle (EV) charging service providers operate their fast charging stations under the same “site”?

No. Just as gasoline stations are separated by brands so should the DCFC stations be separate. Allowing different service providers to operate their fast charging stations under the same “site” can cause issues when it comes to subsidies provided by the primary ratepayers, not to mention maintenance issues.

2. Section 5(2)(b) of the GGRR states that an eligible charging station is a prescribed undertaking if “the public utility reasonably expects, on the date the public utility decides to construct or purchase an eligible charging station, that (i) the station will come into operation by December 31, 2025, and

(ii) if the station will be located in a limited municipality, the number of eligible charging sites in the municipality on the date the station will come into operation will not exceed the site limit for the municipality on that date.”

a. How should “on the date the public utility decides to construct or purchase an eligible charging station” be interpreted?

The date should be the date of the construction contract for an eligible charging station. A letter of intent is non-binding.

b. What information should be used to determine when that date was?

The DCFC service provider should provide a copy of the construction contract upon application to the BCUC for setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking.

c. Should the utility be required to also determine the site where the eligible charging station will be located by that date?

Upon application to the BCUC for setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking, it must demonstrate that it has met the prescribed guidelines under Section 5 of the GGRR. The location of the eligible charging station is location-sensitive and has a site limit determined by the population of a limited municipality.

d. Considering that there may be circumstances where it may not be known if an eligible charging station has met the criteria to be a prescribed undertaking until the station comes into operation, should the BCUC make a determination, on a forecast basis, of whether an eligible charging station is a prescribed undertaking?

As the BCUC is charged within setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking, the commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking. Hence, the BCUC must make a determination on whether an eligible charging station is a prescribed undertaking based on the charging station meeting the criteria, not on a forecast basis of meeting the criteria of a prescribed undertaking.

e. What are the advantages and disadvantages to the utility and its ratepayers of the BCUC making such a determination on a forecast basis?

There is no advantage to the ratepayers for BCUC to make a determination of an eligible charging station under GGRR as Section 5(2)(a) sets out the requirement for the prescribed undertaking.

The disadvantage is that the BCUC may not have the jurisdiction under the CEA and GGRR to make the determination on a forecast basis.

There is no disadvantage to the public utility provided it proceeds per GGRR Section 5(2)(a).

3. The GGRR was amended on June 22, 2020, to include EV charging stations as a prescribed undertaking. FBC submits that section 18 of the CEA and

section 5 of the GGRR have a “retrospective” effect, “as they require the recovery of the costs of all charging stations that come into operation by December 31, 2025, which by definition includes stations in operation prior to June 22, 2020.”¹

a. Does section 5 of the GGRR include fast-charging stations that came into operation prior to June 22, 2020, as a prescribed undertaking on a retrospective basis? Why or why not?

No, there is no indication that section 5 of the GGRR includes fast-charging stations that came into operation prior to June 22, 2020, as a prescribed undertaking on a retrospective basis. The only requirement appears to be that the public utility constructs and operates, or purchases and operates, an eligible charging station that is in a class defined as a prescribed undertaking for section 18 of the Act.

b. In the case of a station that needed to be upgraded to meet the criteria to be a prescribed undertaking, what portion of the total capital cost of the upgraded station should be allowed into a public utility’s rate base? For instance, would this be the entire cost of the upgraded station less accumulated depreciation or only the incremental investment portion for the upgrade? Please provide reasons in support.

The GGRR Section 18(2) states:

In setting rates under the Utilities Commission Act for a public utility carrying out a prescribed undertaking, the commission must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking.

Therefore, the rates must be set that allow the public utility to recover its costs within each fiscal year. There is no provision to permit these costs to be allowed into a public utilities rate base.

However, since BCUC appears to be permitting these costs to be allowed into a public utilities rate base, only the incremental investment portion for the upgrade should be allowed as the accumulated depreciation is only an estimate.

Hence, the entire upgrade costs of a prescribed undertaking should be recovered.

4. Section 18(2) of the CEA provides that the BCUC "must set rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred with respect to the prescribed undertaking." Section 18(3) of the CEA also provides that the BCUC "must not exercise a power under the Utilities Commission Act in a way that would directly or indirectly prevent a public utility... from carrying out a prescribed undertaking."

4.1. Should all cost components of an eligible charging station be eligible for recovery under the GGRR (for example, paving costs, lighting installation and maintenance costs, washroom facilities, wheelchair-accessible ramps)? Why or why not?

GGRR Section 5(1) defines "eligible charging station" means a fast-charging station that is available for use 24 hours a day by any member of the public, does not require users to be members of a charging network and is capable of charging electric vehicles of more than one make, and defines a "fast charging station" means a fixed device capable of charging an electric vehicle using a direct current. All ancillary services are undefined as part of an eligible charging station.

Paving costs, lighting installation and maintenance costs, washroom facilities, wheelchair accessible ramps may be necessary for the station to be available for use 24 hours a day by any member of the public. Hence, paving, lighting, maintenance, washrooms and accessibility ramps that support the 24 hours a day use by any member of the public should be included in the cost of the station.

4.2. If reasonable limits on cost recovery are required, how should they be determined and why?

The reasonable limits on cost recovery must be determined by the BCUC and should have a price cap on what the utility can charge. The price cap can be determined using a ratio to the price of gasoline pump cost. BC Hydro's information currently shows the electric energy: fuel cost ratio as 1:4.62. The price cap could be set at 1:1.5 to encourage the continued use of EVs.

Chapter 5.

Conclusions

5.1. Levelized Rates

Once the DCFC charging stations are determined to be eligible charging stations (prescribed undertaking), the Commission must set the rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred.

The rates set must be fair and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable the service provider to recover its costs incurred.

The idling fee should be considered to encourage good behaviour at the stations and to keep charging stations available for other users.

However, allowing the DCFC charging station costs into the rate base may create a situation where the private DCFC station providers are at a disadvantage; and the need for leveled rates versus floating rates adjusted periodically may not be an issue when the Commission takes into consideration the difference in fuel costs as portrayed by the BC Hydro fuel cost analysis.

Do these leveled rates limit or discourage the participation of other non-utility service providers in this market?

I would suggest that the leveled rates be adjusted periodically or annually to keep pace with changes in energy prices, inflation, and other unforeseen events such as COVID. This will provide some protection for the existing ratepayers as well as other non-utility charging station service providers and complies with the CEA criteria - “set the rates that allow the public utility to collect sufficient revenue in each fiscal year to enable it to recover its costs incurred”.

Idling fees should be considered when determining the rates to ensure the availability of the charging stations for other EV users.

5.2. Metering

When metering is available, it should include a demand charge and energy charge to distinguish between the different charging station ratings.

5.3. FLO

The Tier 2 level of service should be eliminated and only Tier 1 service provided that support the 24 hours a day use by any member of the public.

5.4. Costs Permitted

Paving, lighting, maintenance, washrooms and accessibility ramps that support the 24 hours a day use by any member of the public should be included in the cost of the charging stations.

5.5. Prescribed Undertaking

No, there is no indication that section 5 of the GGRR includes fast-charging stations that came into operation prior to June 22, 2020, as a prescribed undertaking on a retrospective basis. The only requirement appears to be that the public utility constructs and operates, or purchases and operates, an eligible charging station that is in a class defined as a prescribed undertaking for section 18 of the Act. The applicant should be made to demonstrate that a binding agreement (for construction and operation, or purchases and operation) has been entered into if the fast-charging stations came into operation prior to June 22, 2020. A non-binding letter of intent should not be considered sufficient.

5.6. Rate Schedule 96 – Exemption

As sufficient incentives are already provided to the EV owners, no exemption from RS 96 rate changes should be permitted by the Panel or BCUC.