

# William J. Andrews

## Barrister & Solicitor

1958 Parkside Lane, North Vancouver, BC, Canada, V7G 1X5  
Phone: 604-924-0921, Fax: 604-924-0918, Email: wjandrews@shaw.ca

April 7, 2017

British Columbia Utilities Commission  
Sixth Floor, 900 Howe Street, Box 250  
Vancouver, BC, V6Z 2N3  
Attn: Patrick Wruck, Commission Secretary  
By Web Posting

Dear Sir:

Re: FortisBC Inc. Application for Reconsideration and Variance of Order G-199-16  
Project No.3698875  
B.C. Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club B.C.  
Submissions on Reconsideration Phase One Questions

---

Pursuant to the Commission's April 3, 2017 letter to FBC [Exhibit A-2] inviting submissions regarding phase one questions from interveners in the proceeding that led to Order G-199-16, these are BCSEA-SCBC's submissions.

On March 17, 2017, FBC filed an Application for Reconsideration and Variance of Order G-199-16 (Reconsideration Application), on the basis that the Majority Decision discloses material errors of fact and law.

### **1. Should there be a reconsideration by the Commission?**

Yes, BCSEA-SCBC's view is that there should be a reconsideration of Order G-199-16, albeit for somewhat different reasons than those stated by FBC.

BCSEA-SCBC respectfully submit that the primary error by the Majority of the original panel concerns the issue of whether to move the FBC Net Metering Program to a "kWh Bank" mechanism from a "Dollar Bank" mechanism. They submit that the Majority erred in considering the issue solely as a "mechanism to implement FBC's proposed pricing."<sup>1</sup> As a result of this error, the Majority rejected the "kWh Bank" mechanism without considering it on its merits.

BCSEA-SCBC submit that reconsideration of the "kWh Bank" mechanism will necessarily require a fresh analysis of the issues of (a) the price for annual net excess generation and (b) eligibility or ineligibility for the Net Metering Program based on whether a customer has had, or is expected to have, regular positive annual net excess generation.

### **2. If there is to be a reconsideration, should the Commission hear new evidence and should new parties be given the opportunity to present evidence?**

BCSEA-SCBC do not see a need for new evidence. Nor do they see a need for new parties to be given an opportunity to present evidence. The original proceeding produced an extensive evidentiary record and was participated in by a full range of interveners.

---

<sup>1</sup> On this point, BCSEA-SCBC agree with FBC in paragraph 48 of the Application.

**3. If there is to be a reconsideration, should it focus on the items from the application for reconsideration, a subset of these items, or additional items?**

In BCSEA-SCBC's view, if there is a reconsideration it should focus on the "kWh Bank" mechanism, the price for annual net excess generation, and the conditions for participation in the Net Metering Program by customers with regular positive annual net excess generation.

All the above is respectfully submitted.

Yours truly,

William J. Andrews



Barrister & Solicitor

cc. Distribution List by email