

REQUESTOR NAME: **BCOAPO**
INFORMATION REQUEST ROUND NO: **1**
TO: **FortisBC**
DATE: **June 15, 2016**
APPLICATION NAME: **FortisBC Inc. – Net Metering
Program Tariff Update
Application**

1.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 2

Preamble: The Application states that “the Company is also using the Application process to provide notice to residential customers ... that the billing practice in use for Net Metering since the Residential Conservation Rate (RCR) was implemented will be updated”

1.1 Has FortisBC sent a copy of the Application to each residential net metering customer?

2.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 3

2.1 What is the “provincial policy consideration” that the current FBC Net Metering Tariff sought to address?

**3.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 3 (lines 27-29) and page 4 (lines 2-6)
Exhibit A2-1, page 5**

Preamble: Exhibit A2-1 indicates that as of the March 2011 Report there were four net metering installations all of which required net energy deliveries.

3.1 For each of the calendar years 2011 up to 2015 please indicate: i) the total number of net metering customers, ii) the number with net energy deliveries for the year and iii) for each of those with a positive NEG at the end of the calendar year the kWh involved.

3.2 Under the current Schedule 95 (provision #5) FortisBC has the discretion of purchasing the NEG at the end of the calendar year or including it in the billing calculation for the next period. For the period 2011 through 2015 what has been FortisBC’s actual practice in dealing with NEG balances at the end of the calendar year.

4.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 7 (lines 32-34)

Preamble: The Application states “What will be disallowed under the Net Metering Tariff is generation sized to routinely exceed a customer’s annual requirements, which is counter to the intent of the Program”.

- 4.1 Does FortisBC currently reject Net Metering Applications and/or Net Metering Interconnection Agreements on the grounds that the generation is sized to meet more than the customer's annual requirements?
- 4.1.1 If so, how is this determination made?
- 4.1.2 To date, how many applications have been rejected?
- 4.2 Going forward how does FortisBC plan on "disallowing" Net Metering in instances where the generation is sized to routinely exceed a customer's annual requirements? What criteria will be used in making this determination?
- 5.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 7 (lines 18-23)
Exhibit B-1, page 8 (lines 17-19)**
- Preamble:** The Application states: "The program should not encourage customers to generate electricity in an amount greater than their own needs by paying for excess energy at artificially high prices".
- 5.1 Please explain why the prices under the RCR are considered to be artificially high.
- 5.2 Does this mean that regular Residential customers billed under the RCR are paying "artificially high prices"? If not, why not?
- 6.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 11 (lines 4-8)**
- 6.1 The Application states that use of the BC Hydro RS3808 Tranche 1 rate is "consistent with the approach used for other ad-hoc deliveries to the FBC system". Please indicate in what other situations the BC Hydro RS3808 rate is used.
- 6.2 Are there situations where FortisBC uses a rate other than the RS3808 Tranche 1 rate to value ad-hoc deliveries to its system? If yes, what are they and what rate is used?
- 7.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 11 (lines 26-29)**
- Preamble:** The Application states that for "the 25 Residential participants between February 2015 and February 2016 all but two would have received lower billings had the recommended changes been in place".
- 7.1 Of the 25, how many had positive NEG over the 12 months?
- 7.2 Does the reference to "recommended changes" include just the two changes discussed in Section 5.2 or also the changes discussed in Section 6?

- 7.2.1 If the lower billings are the result of changes as outlined in both Sections, how many customers would have lower billings just as result of the Section 5.2 changes?
- 7.2.2 How many had lower billings specifically due to: i) change to the carry forward of kWh (per page 10 lines 23-27), ii) the change in the payment for NEG at year end (per page 10, lines 27-29) and iii) the combined effect of two changes?

8.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, Appendix B

- 8.1 Which of the two interpretations has FortisBC been applying to date?
- 8.2 Please provide examples of the billing under each of the interpretations where kWhs received by the customer are 1,200 and kWhs delivered to FortisBC are 4,000.