



**ORDER NUMBER  
G-71-25**

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

and

Oakridge Energy Limited Partnership  
Reconsideration and Variance of Order G-342-24

**BEFORE:**

T. A. Loski, Commissioner

on March 18, 2025

**ORDER**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. On February 14, 2025, Oakridge Energy Limited Partnership (Oakridge Energy) filed an application with the British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) pursuant to section 99 of the *Utilities Commission Act* (UCA) for reconsideration and variance of Directives 2 and 8 of the Oakridge Energy District Energy System 2024 to 2026 Revenue Requirements and Rates (2024-2026 RRA) Order G-342-24 with decision (Reconsideration Application);
- B. On December 17, 2024, the BCUC issued Order G-342-24 with decision, in which:
  - (i) Directive 2 provided that Oakridge Energy was to establish a non-rate base Revenue Stabilization Account (RSA), attracting interest at its weighted average cost of capital, to capture the annual revenue deficiencies or surpluses resulting from the difference between the annual revenue at the approved capacity charges and the approved capacity revenue requirement; and
  - (ii) Directive 8 provided approval for Oakridge Energy to record the amount of the annual RSA additions for each of the heating and cooling services, effective July 1, 2024, January 1, 2025 and January 1, 2026, as set out in Section 3.0 of that decision and subject to the directives and determinations in that order;
- C. In the Reconsideration Application, Oakridge Energy submits, among other things, that circumstances which have a material bearing on its costs and revenues have unfolded differently from the circumstances on which Order G-342-24 with decision was based and the extent and materiality of these changes are grounds for reconsideration;
- D. Oakridge Energy proposes a written regulatory process for the review of the Reconsideration Application, including the opportunity to file an evidentiary update, one round of BCUC information requests and final argument; and

- E. The BCUC has reviewed the Reconsideration Application and considers that the establishment of a regulatory timetable is warranted.

**NOW THEREFORE** the BCUC orders as follows:

1. A regulatory timetable for the review of the Reconsideration Application is established as set out in Appendix A to this order.
2. Oakridge Energy is directed to make the Reconsideration Application available on its website and to provide a copy of this order to all known and anticipated customers of Phase 1 of the Oakridge Centre property redevelopment by Thursday, March 27, 2025.
3. Oakridge Energy is directed to post notice of the Reconsideration Application and this order on its existing social media platforms by Thursday, March 27, 2025.
4. Oakridge Energy is directed to provide written confirmation to the BCUC that it has complied with Directives 2 and 3 of this order by Tuesday, April 1, 2025.
5. Oakridge Energy is directed to submit an evidentiary update to the Reconsideration Application in accordance with the requirements established in Appendix B to this order by Tuesday, April 29, 2025.

**DATED** at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 18<sup>th</sup> day of March 2025.

BY ORDER

*Electronically signed by Tom Loski*

T. A. Loski  
Commissioner

Oakridge Energy Limited Partnership  
Reconsideration and Variance of Order G-342-24

**REGULATORY TIMETABLE**

---

Action	Date (2025)
Oakridge Energy provides notice of the Reconsideration Application	Thursday, March 27
Oakridge Energy provides confirmation of compliance with public notice requirements	Tuesday, April 1
Oakridge Energy files an evidentiary update	Tuesday, April 29
BCUC Information Request (IR) No. 1 to Oakridge Energy	Thursday, May 15
Oakridge Energy responses to BCUC IR No. 1	Friday, May 30
Letters of comment deadline	Thursday, June 5
Oakridge Energy final argument and reply to letters of comment	Thursday, June 12

Oakridge Energy Limited Partnership  
Reconsideration and Variance of Order G-342-24

**EVIDENTIARY UPDATE REQUIREMENTS**

---

Pursuant to Directive 5 of the accompanying order, Oakridge Energy is directed to file the following as an evidentiary update to the Reconsideration Application, by the date established in the regulatory timetable:

1. For each building/customer presented in Table 1 of the Reconsideration Application, confirmation of when Oakridge Energy first became aware that the target connection date reported in July 2024 (Column B) would not be met and when Oakridge Energy first became aware of the trending connection date as of January 23, 2025 (Column C).
2. Confirmation of when Oakridge Energy first became aware that only two out of twelve Phase 1 buildings/customers would at the end of 2024: (i) be physically connected to the Oakridge Energy district energy system, and (ii) be supplied with a limited amount of heating energy for construction purposes during work hours.<sup>1</sup>
3. An update (to the date of the evidentiary update) for when each Phase 1 building/customer is expected to begin using the following services:
  - a. A limited amount of heating energy for construction purposes during work hours;
  - b. The full amount of heating energy (pro-rated if appropriate) for the annual forecast energy demand;
  - c. A limited amount of cooling energy for construction purposes during work hours (if applicable); and
  - d. The full amount of cooling energy (pro-rated if appropriate) for the annual forecast energy demand.
4. Section B of Table 2 of the Application presents a hypothetical scenario where all heating and cooling customer connections are delayed for six months as compared to Section A of Table 2 and operating and maintenance (O&M) costs, lease and property tax costs, fees and levies remain the same between the two sections. Please provide an explanation for why these costs remain the same despite differences in the number of customers connected to the Oakridge Energy district energy system for heating or cooling service.
5. An extended version of Table 2 of the Application under the hypothetical scenario,<sup>2</sup> such that Section A, Section B and the cumulative difference in Revenue Stabilization Account (RSA) additions between Sections B and A of Table 2, extends to one year after the end of the 10-year levelization period (i.e. year 2033 plus one year = year 2034) that was used to model the heating and cooling capacity charges and the related built-up/draw down of the RSA.<sup>3</sup> Please discuss whether this extended version of Table 2 of the Application would suggest that the delays to customer connections would result in a permanent difference between the cumulative RSA additions of Sections A and B and whether the impact is substantial from the customers' perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit B-1, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit B-1, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Oakridge Energy District Energy System 2024 to 2026 Revenue Requirements and Rates Order G-342-24 with decision dated December 17, 2024 (2024–2026 RRA Decision), p. 8.

6. A revised version of Table 2 of the Application, under the following scenario, to revise the difference between Sections B and A:
  - a. Use the 2024 actual results in the “Forecast 2024” column in Section B;
  - b. Reflect the trending customer connection targets as provided in Evidentiary Update Requirement #3 above such that a mix of 2025 actual and 2025 forecast customer connections are used, rather than the hypothetical six-month delay scenario in Section B; and
  - c. Segregate the RSA additions between heating and cooling services, in accordance with the BCUC’s previous direction.<sup>4</sup>
7. Explanations for why the proposed replacement for Directive 8 as set out on page 11 of the Reconsideration Application does not include cost variances in amortization expense nor income taxes as part of the exclusions for RSA additions, commencing in 2025.<sup>5</sup> Please provide a revised Directive 8, as applicable.
8. Clarification as to whether Oakridge Energy is seeking approval as part of the proposed variance to Directive 2 to record variances not covered by the exclusions contained in proposed Directive 8 for a specified period of time or indefinitely, with supporting rationale. As part of the response, please discuss whether Oakridge Energy considered seeking its requested approvals for the RSA<sup>6</sup> for 2024 and 2025 only, and not 2026. If not, please explain why not.

---

<sup>4</sup> 2024–2026 RRA Decision, pp. 9, 17.

<sup>5</sup> 2024–2026 RRA Decision, p. 12.

<sup>6</sup> Exhibit B-1, p. 11.