



**ORDER NUMBER**  
**G-157-17**

IN THE MATTER OF  
the *Utilities Commission Act*, RSBC 1996, Chapter 473

and

British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority  
Complaint filed by M.U. and L.Y.

**BEFORE:**

B. A. Magnan, Commissioner

on October 19, 2017

**ORDER**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. In a letter dated September 1, 2016, British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (BC Hydro) customers (M.U. and L.Y.) filed a complaint with the British Columbia Utilities Commission (Commission) concerning the Extension Fee required by BC Hydro to relocate service on M.U. and L.Y.'s property (Complaint);
- B. Prior to their home renovations, M.U. and L.Y.'s existing service (up to 100A) was changed from a permanent service to a temporary service on March 23, 2014. After completing the renovations, M.U. and L.Y. requested that BC Hydro relocate the service back to permanent service on their property;
- C. BC Hydro's states that M.U. and L.Y.'s electrician requested a 200A service to M.U. and L.Y.'s property before the renovation; therefore BC Hydro asserts that M.U. and L.Y.'s request is considered an Extension under section 1 of BC Hydro's Electric Tariff (Tariff). Based on this position, BC Hydro informed M.U. and L.Y. that an Extension Fee would be required to relocate service on their property;
- D. M.U. and L.Y. viewed their request as being a request to have their service relocated and did not view their request as an Extension and therefore disagreed with BC Hydro's Extension Fee requirement. M.U. and L.Y. clarified that they want to return back to their original service;
- E. From September 1, 2016 to July 4, 2017, M.U. and L.Y. provided the Commission with additional information regarding their Complaint;
- F. Commission staff reviewed the Complaint according to the Commission's Customer Complaint Guide, and through various correspondence between September 1, 2016, and June 29, 2017, Commission staff requested additional information from BC Hydro regarding the Complaint;
- G. Through various correspondence between October 27, 2016, and June 30, 2017, BC Hydro provided the Commission with information in response to the Complaint and Commission staff requests;

- H. On January 20, 2017, the Commission issued Order G-5-17 for the BC Hydro 2015 Rate Design Application which included changes to the Tariff definition of an Extension;
- I. On January 27, 2017, Commission staff issued a summary and evaluation closing the Complaint based on information suggesting that M.U. and L.Y.'s house required a 200A service due to the renovations to their property;
- J. On February 3, 2017, the Commission received further information from M.U. and L.Y. and the Complaint was reopened;
- K. On June 30, 2017, BC Hydro confirmed that M.U. and L.Y.'s property can remain connected to a 100A service;
- L. On August 4, 2017, the Commission issued Order G-118-17 establishing a regulatory timetable to review the Complaint;
- M. On August 16, 2017, the Commission issued Information Requests (IRs) to both M.U. and L.Y. and BC Hydro. M.U. and L.Y. and BC Hydro responded to the Commission IRs on August 17, 2017 and August 23, 2017, respectively;
- N. On August 28, 2017, BC Hydro provided final comments on the Complaint and requested the proceeding be suspended in order discuss potential resolutions with M.U. and L.Y. directly;
- O. On August 31, 2017, the Commission issued Letter L-19-17 denying the suspension of the proceeding and requested BC Hydro and M.U. and L.Y. make arrangements to meet and discuss possible resolutions to the Complaint and provide a report to the Commission including any proposed resolutions;
- P. On September 5, 2017, BC Hydro and M.U. and L.Y. met on site to review the electrical equipment and discuss possible options for resolution;
- Q. On September 14, 2017, BC Hydro provided a report to the Commission summarizing the site meeting and indicated a proposed agreement had been reached. This report indicated that BC Hydro would proceed with the work once M.U. and L.Y. request for service is submitted and the appropriate documentation and payment is received;
- R. On September 15, 2017, the Commission issued Letter L-23-17 to remind all parties that M.U and L.Y. reserve the right to respond with any comments on the submitted report and any proposed resolution. The Letter L-23-17 noted that upon receipt of all documents relating to this matter, the Commission will review the evidence and makes its findings accordingly;
- S. On September 21, 2017 M.U. and L.Y. submitted their final reply and indicated they are satisfied with the mutually agreed upon proposal; and
- T. The Commission reviewed the various correspondences and supporting material in relation to the Complaint and recognizes that both parties have now reached a mutually acceptable agreement whereby BC Hydro will swing back the 100A service and charge the standard 100A overhead service connection fee of \$799 plus GST.

**NOW THEREFORE**, pursuant to section 83 of the *Utilities Commission Act*, the Commission orders as follows:

1. The Complaint is closed as resolved.
2. In the next revenue requirements application, BC Hydro is directed to provide the Commission with an analysis of the rationale behind the changes to the Tariff definition of an Extension as outlined in the 2015 Rate Design Application and the application of Rate Schedule 1300 as it applies to a Temporary Service connection for existing BC Hydro residential customers.

**DATED** at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of October 2017.

BY ORDER

*Original signed by:*

B. A. Magnan  
Commissioner