

ATCO ELECTRIC YUKON AND YUKON ENERGY CORPORATION
APPLICATION FOR CHANGES TO TERMS AND CONDITIONS (T&Cs)

Max Fraser's Information Request First Round
28FEB2025

MF-AEY/YEC-1-1:

Reference: Application dated December 20, 2024

PAGE 3 of Introduction - Item 9 and Section 4.13 - Multiple Dwellings

IR:

(a) What is the rationale for the differential treatment of electricity use and consequent costs through the different rate schedules to residential customers in single family dwellings versus those in multiple dwellings for items "such as hallways, lobbies, laundry rooms, elevators and parkades" for that are in multiple dwellings compared to that of single-family dwellings. On the surface, there appears to be no justification for discriminatory treatment for those who reside in multiple dwellings, so can the utilities please

(i) provide the reasons for the differential treatment and

(ii) describe the presumably negative impact on revenues and operations that would occur should the residential charges in multiple dwellings be on par with those in single family dwellings, and

(iii) describe the calculations for a scenario where there was no differential allowed for single family and multiple dwellings.

(b) does the definition proposed in the T&Cs include operations such as heating and lighting for purposes associated with residential use including greenhouses, outbuildings used for other purposes (animal sheds/barns etc.) that are permitted uses in, for example, the zoning bylaw of the City of Whitehorse.

MF-AEY/YEC-1-2

Reference: Application dated December 20, 2024

PAGE 3 of Introduction - Item 9 and section 4.13 Multiple Dwellings

The Utilities propose in instances where delivery of service is through a single point to charge the general service (non-residential) price schedule.

IR:

(a) have the utilities examined and can they provide evidence of the treatment of single point delivery in other jurisdictions to determine what is the most common practice across Canada and if so what is the result of that research? In other words, is this customary practice elsewhere in Canada?

(b) If the utilities have not made such a determination can they please do so for this application so that intervenors and the board can consider whether an apparently unjustified discriminatory practice is common elsewhere, and what the reasons/justification for those may be?

(c)

(i) as the proposal is for an effect of charging general service rates to multiple family dwellings, which involves the application of a demand charge, can the utilities please provide rationale for the reasons for the demand charge, the typical annual revenues of same and evidence of how the revenues raised are applied to increasing the additional capacity to the system to satisfy the additional demand?

(ii) as the application of a demand charge typically involves setting a rate for 12 months based on the highest demand in a six-month period, can the utilities please explain what is the most common and acceptable practice in the case of jurisdictions elsewhere in Canada?

(iii) as the application of a demand charge to residential customers involves a net higher cost to the customer, can the utilities explain the justification/rationale for higher costs for persons in multiple dwellings compared to those in single family; in other words, what could possibly justify the higher cost of one class of residential customers compared to another?

(iv) as single point of service enables use of modern software applications to distribute costs to customers within a multiple dwelling, what rationale/justifications can the utilities provide to explain to discriminate against use of new technology that may enable greater energy efficiencies as well as lower costs?