

Nathaniel Yee
PO Box 89
Faro, YT Y0B1K0

28-February, 2025

AEY-YEC 2024-25 Terms and Conditions of Service Application

IRs, round 1.

1. Topic: AEY and YEC Rebasing and Bill Simplification. The Rebasing proceeding was a limited review of what can be more fully addressed in this T&C proceeding.

The Rebasing proceeding was supposed to answer a YUB directive in Board Order 2022-07 which read as follows:

The Board is concerned that customers may find the application of YEC's and AEY's riders to be confusing. Therefore, the Board directs YEC and AEY to provide, within 180 days of issuance of this Order, a proposal to the Board on incorporating these riders into existing base rates.

Years later, in late 2024 after the results of the Rebasing proceeding were finally implemented there were 5 riders on residential billing statements. Before implementation, there were also 5 riders.

- a) Please explain how replacing a couple of riders with different riders made things less confusing from a customer perspective.
- b) Have customers commented on or appreciated that the new riders are less confusing than the old ones?
- c) Do the Utilities have any other ideas, or perhaps more effective ideas on how to make billing statements or the riders less confusing?

2. Topic: Actual Rates, and display of actual rates on billing statements.

“In AEY's view, the primary advantage to customers of being informed of what they are actually paying for electricity is that it allows them to make informed decisions about energy usage, including adjusting their energy usage to save on their monthly bills. That advantage only arises if the information on billing statements is useful and comprehensible.”¹

1 AEY Response to Motions and YUB Directions - Oct. 27, 2023, pdf p.5 response to AEY-NY-005.

a) Given that AEY has stated that knowing actual rates would benefit customers, how do the Utilities propose to present actual rates inclusive of the riders on billing statements in a manner that is useful and comprehensible?

b) As an example, actual rates could be displayed as follows:

Actual Rates Inclusive of Riders: Customer Charge \$26.10
 Energy Charge \$.1894/kWh First 1000 kWh
 \$.xxxx/kWh 1001-2500 kWh
 \$.xxxx/kWh >2500 kWh

This would be trivial to implement and would benefit customers as AEY has indicated. Please comment on the advantages and disadvantages from a customer perspective of displaying rates in this manner, and please suggest better ways to provide “useful and comprehensible” actual rates to customers.

c) Would customers be better served by the two column example below? This would allow customers the choice of seeing the riders on the right, or looking at the simplified version with actual rates on the left. Again, if the Utilities believe this not an ideal solution, please suggest improvements.

Adding this readable summary to the left of.... the current billing statement here,

Current Charges Inclusive of Riders		CURRENT CHARGES DETAILS	
Monthly Customer Charge Including Riders	26.10	CUSTOMER CHARGE	24.88
Energy Charge Including Riders	74.81	ENERGY CHARGE	81.41
(395 kWh @ .1894 per kWh)		AEY TEMPORARY RATE ADJUSTMENT	0.72 CR
(0 kWh @ .xxxx per kWh)		FUEL ADJUSTMENT RIDER	1.14 CR
(0 kWh @ .xxxx per kWh)		YEC LWRF RIDER	0.51 CR
		YEC TEMPORARY RATE TRUE UP	5.92
		YUKON INTERIM ELECTRICAL REBATE	8.93 CR
Sub-Total	100.91	SUB-TOTAL	100.91
GST	5.05	GST	5.05
Current Billing	105.96	CURRENT BILLING	105.96
Amount Due	105.96	AMOUNT DUE	105.96

Some customers want to see all of the riders, while others prefer a simplified billing statement, and this provides for both. Again, what improvements would the Utilities suggest – or what would be the best way to provide customers with this information?

3. Topic: Estimated Meter Readings: A growing concern, with estimated readings in Faro for 3 of the last 4 months of 2024.

a) Estimated readings can cause the Utilities to overcharge customers when rate changes occur around the same period. If a customer uses more than is estimated for

a January billing, and there is a rate increase the next month – and an actual reading, a customer will be paying for January’s additional usage at the higher February rate. How do the utilities propose to solve this issue?

- b) Another issue with estimated meter readings is “estimated reading shock”. This can happen if an estimated reading is much higher than a customer was expecting, though it is more common that after a couple of estimated readings, the billing for actual usage is much higher than expected. Having had low (too low) estimates for January and February, customers might not be prepared to pay a suddenly much higher amount for March when less usage actually occurred. How do the utilities propose to ameliorate this issue?
- c) Noting that there is a charge for “supplementary meter reads”, should there also be a refund for missed meter readings – when customers are forced to accept estimated meter readings that do not reflect actual usage?

4. Topic: Schedule D, Customer Usage Information Requests

- a) Please provide examples of typical and minimal usage requests that would be subject to the \$75 charge.
- b) What other information can be included in a request? Riders active at the time? Rates?

5. Topic: Standard Meters and Non-Standard Meters, AMI Meters.

- a) Please clarify terminology. It appears that a Standard Meter is an AMI meter, while Non-Standard is a non-AMI meter. Is this correct? Are there multiple types of AMI meters or non-AMI meters?
- b) What type(s) of meters are currently being installed by default, and what types of meters are available by request, and what are the cost differences?
- c) In the AEY proceeding, AMI meters were found to be less expensive than non-AMI meters. Are non-AMI meters still being installed other than by customer request?
- d) How many AMI meters were installed in the last year, and how many non-AMI?