

Sixth Floor, 900 Howe Street, Box 250
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6Z 2N3Phone: 604-660-4700
BC Toll Free: 1-800-663-1385
Fax: 604-660-1102
www.b cuc.com**British Columbia
Utilities Commission**

Letter of Comment

In accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to submit a letter of comment concerning an application currently before the Commission, please provide a completed form to commission.secretary@bcuc.com. If email is unavailable, please mail the form to the address above. By doing so, you acknowledge that all letters of comment are published with the author's name as part of the public evidentiary record, both in print copy and on the Commission's website. All personal contact information provided on this page is removed before posting to the website. Forms must be received by the Commission by the last filing date included in the proceeding's regulatory timetable before final arguments.

Proceeding name Are you currently registered as an intervener or interested party? Name (first and last) City

Province

Email Phone number

Letter of Comment

Name (first and last)

Andy Shadrack

Date:

May 18, 2016

Comment: Please specify the reasons for your interest in the proceeding, your views concerning the proceeding, any relevant information that supports or explains your views, the conclusion you support and any recommendations. The Commission may disallow comments that do not comply with the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Kaslo, British Columbia

May 16th, 2016

FortisBC Inc. Net Metering Program Tariff Update Application ~ Project No.3698875

Attention: Ms Laurel Ross, Commission Secretary and Director

We are a group of six FortisBC net-metering customers from the Kaslo area who, having previously invested over \$156,000 in household electrical infrastructure, are concerned with the speed at which the Commission panel has set the regulatory timetable, without any reference to the residential customers who use this energy conservation program.

In exhibit A2 Ms Roy references the Commission receiving the original application from FortisBC on February 5th, 2016. Yet FortisBC did not write a notification letter to us until April 26th, and before we even had a chance to contact FortisBC, as invited to in their letter to us, the Commission panel set a regulatory timetable without so much as allowing us to make a single comment as to how this hearing should be framed.

None of us are as yet registered as intervenors, and yet the Commission panel has decided that the format shall contain no oral component or second round of intervenor questions in an application that will cost us, collectively, hundreds if not thousands of dollars every calendar year. Having made our investments based on the current Net Metering Tariff Rate Schedule 95, and then, in addition, having signed agreements accordingly with FortisBC for systems of up to "50 kw and voltage below 750 Volts", we regard some aspects of what FortisBC is applying for, before the Commission, as potentially being a "breach" of what was agreed to when we signed up to this energy conservation program.

We therefore wish the Commission panel to slow down, and in accordance with sections 99 and 100 of the Utilities Commission Act, reconsider Order G-59-16, to give us, the users of this FortisBC net-metering energy conservation program, a chance to fully participate and have some say about how the discussion will be framed.

First, we ask the Commission to direct FortisBC to outline in writing the financial facts for the claims made in its application, before we are required to prepare our first questions as intervenors. Second as lay people not used to the rigors of written hearing requirements, we would like to see an oral portion added to the hearing so that we can cross-examine FortisBC after the first round of intervenor questions has been answered.

Why should, for example, FortisBC cherry pick one rate to pay net metering customers without outlining all the rates it is paying to purchase electricity, and what is FortisBC paying out per billing period and calendar year for net-metering, as compared to other demand side and energy conservation programs that it operates?

Above all we wish to remind the Commission panel that, while we respect your right to set the regulatory timetable and framework, we believe that we have the right, as residential customers who have heavily invested in our own electrical generation, to respond to FortisBC's application and to be given the time to prepare our facts and our case, and consult with other net-metering customers who use this and other FortisBC programs.

We believe that the Commission panel needs to slow this hearing process down and give us the time to prepare appropriate input, so that the public does not perceive that the Commission is just a rubber stamp for FortisBC's application.

Finally, we think that the Commission has a unique opportunity, after seven years of operation, to ask the customers of FortisBC who are using this energy conservation program the following questions:

- 1) Why have approximately only 100 of FortisBC's customers enrolled in this program since it was introduced in 2009?
- 2) What are the benefits and drawbacks to the current tariff?
- 3) How could the program, as it is currently constituted, be tweaked to work to the mutual benefit of both customers and FortisBC, and within the mandate of the BC Utilities Commission?

All of which is respectfully submitted,

Philip Trotter and Michelle Poulin
Christopher and Joanna Temple
John and Kare Cathro
Gail Bauman and Andy Shadrack
Patrick Mallet
Donald Scarlett
Philip Sarsons