



**V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited.  
Permission to Cease and  
Discontinue Operations**

**FortisAlberta Inc.  
Sale and Transfer of the V N M Rural Electrification  
Association Limited Distribution System**

**October 6, 2015**

**Alberta Utilities Commission**

Decision 20733-D01-2015

V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited

Permission to Cease and Discontinue Operations

FortisAlberta Inc.

Sale and Transfer of the V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited Distribution System

Proceeding 20733

Applications 20733-A001 and 20733-A002

October 6, 2015

Published by the:

Alberta Utilities Commission

Fifth Avenue Place, Fourth Floor, 425 First Street S.W.

Calgary, Alberta

T2P 3L8

Telephone: 403-592-8845

Fax: 403-592-4406

Website: [www.auc.ab.ca](http://www.auc.ab.ca)

**V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited**  
**Permission to Cease and Discontinue Operations**

**FortisAlberta Inc.**  
**Sale and Transfer of the V N M Rural Electrification**  
**Association Limited Distribution System**

**Decision 20733-D01-2015**  
**Proceeding 20733**  
**Applications 20733-A001 and 20733-A002**

---

**1 Introduction**

1. On August 13, 2015, the V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited<sup>1</sup> (VNM REA), applied to the Alberta Utilities Commission for approval to cease and discontinue the operation of its electric distribution system pursuant to Section 29(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* on the basis that the VNM REA's assets were to be sold and transferred pursuant to Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. The VNM REA application was registered as Application 20733-A001.

2. Also on August 13, 2015, FortisAlberta Inc. (Fortis) applied to the AUC for approval of the sale, transfer and operation of the VNM REA assets pursuant to Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. The application was registered as Application 20733-A002.

3. Fortis requested that the Commission consider the applications jointly; therefore, the Commission combined the applications into Proceeding 20733.

4. On August 17, 2015, the AUC issued a filing announcement that was automatically emailed to all eFiling System users that had chosen to be notified of filing announcements issued by the Commission.

5. The Commission received a statement of intent to participate from EQUUS REA Ltd., Lakeland Rural Electrification Association Ltd., North Parkland Power REA Ltd. and Rocky Rural Electrification Association Ltd. (collectively, the intervening REAs). The intervening REAs sought intervener status on the basis that there are legal and policy oriented issues that are of a substantial and material interest to them.

6. The Commission issued a ruling on September 24, 2015, denying the intervening REAs standing in the proceeding for the reasons set out in that ruling. A copy of the Commission's standing ruling is attached as [Appendix A](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> The legal entity name has been used in this document however, the following variations of this name were used in the application and existing approval: VNM Rural Electrification Association, VNM Rural Electrification Association Limited, VNM (Vega Neerlandia Mellowdale) Rural Electrification Association, and V.N.M. Rural Electrification Association Limited.

## 2 Discussion

7. The VNM REA operates an electric distribution system located in a rural region northeast of Barrhead, Alberta.

8. The service area boundary of the VNM REA's electric distribution system was originally approved on September 16, 1975, by way of Approval HE 75143. This approval was subsequently amended in Approval HE 75143A on February 28, 1995.

9. On February 6, 2015, the VNM REA Board of Directors requested a formal offer from Fortis to purchase its electric distribution system.

10. In its application, the VNM REA indicated that on May 14, 2015, it had mailed a notice to each of its members advising that a special general meeting would be held on June 2, 2015. A notice of the special general meeting was also published in a local newspaper on May 19, 2015.<sup>2</sup>

11. On June 2, 2015, a special general meeting of the VNM REA members was held and the members voted on the formal offer by Fortis. Ballots were cast by 338 of the 626 registered members, with 97 per cent of the votes cast being in favour of the extraordinary resolution to sell and transfer the VNM REA assets to Fortis.

12. The Asset Purchase Agreement between the VNM REA and Fortis is dated June 24, 2015. The Asset Purchase Agreement, which includes the purchase price along with other terms of the sale and was filed on the record of this proceeding, indicates that the purchase price for the VNM REA was \$16,008,000. Fortis submitted that the evaluation methodology used to ascertain the purchase price was based on the replacement costs new less depreciation (RCN-D) formula that had been approved previously by the Commission.

13. On July 8, 2015, the VNM REA applied to the Rural Utilities Division of the Alberta Department of Agriculture and Rural Development for approval of the resolutions of the VNM REA for the sale and transfer of the VNM REA's electric distribution system and related assets to Fortis. On August 4, 2015, the Director of the Rural Electrification Associations in and for the Province of Alberta (director of rural electrification associations) approved the resolutions. A copy of the director's approval letter was submitted as part of the VNM REA application.

## 3 Commission findings

### 3.1 Stage one: public interest

14. The VNM REA and Fortis have agreed to the sale and transfer of the VNM REA's electric distribution system, as indicated in the Asset Purchase Agreement. In the following section, the Commission considers whether the sale and transfer is in the public interest, given the documentation on the record of the proceeding. If the Commission approves the sale and transfer, the Commission must then assess the prudence of the purchase price.

---

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit 20733-X0015.

15. The *Rural Utilities Act* sets out the governance requirements to be followed by a rural electrification association in authorizing a sale of its facilities. Section 23 of the *Rural Utilities Act* provides that an association may, by an extraordinary resolution, authorize the sale of all of its works to a utility company. The Commission has reviewed the VNM REA’s application to cease and discontinue its operations and the submitted asset purchase agreement and observes that supporting documentation, such as the resolution of the VNM REA Board of Directors and the agenda of the special general meeting, was included with the application.

16. The Commission understands that, prior to the VNM REA application being submitted to the Commission, the director of rural electrification associations had determined that the applicable resolutions were sufficient to satisfy the requirements contained in the *Rural Utilities Act*.

17. As stated above, the VNM REA has applied to the Commission for permission to cease and discontinue operations in accordance with Section 29(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. Section 29(1) requires the Commission to determine if it is in the public interest to grant a request by an REA to “cease to operate in a service area.”

18. The Commission may also make any order that it considers just and proper and in the public interest.

19. In assessing the public interest, the Commission has considered that the VNM REA’s assets and operations are located within the Fortis service area. The Commission has also considered and relied upon the agreement of Fortis to continue to provide service to the members served by the VNM REA and to “operate, maintain, replace, reconstruct, alter or upgrade”<sup>3</sup> the facilities it acquires. Further, the Commission observes that the VNM REA approached Fortis to make a formal offer and that 97 per cent of the VNM REA members eligible to vote at the special general meeting voted in favour of the sale to Fortis.

20. In addition, the Commission considered the evidence that the director of rural electrification associations has approved the resolutions relating to the sale and transfer pursuant to the *Rural Utilities Act*. In Decisions 2014-040,<sup>4</sup> the Commission commented on how it views an applicant’s compliance with the requirements of another government agency:

...the Commission regards compliance with the existing regulatory requirements administered by other public or government departments or agencies to be important elements when deciding if ... approval of a project is in the public interest.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit 20733-X0014, page 2.

<sup>4</sup> AUC Decision 2014-040: 1646658 Alberta Ltd. Bull Creek Wind Project, Proceeding 1955, Application 1608556, February 20, 2014. Errata issued on March 10, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> AUC Decision 2014-040, paragraph 620. See also EUB Decision 2001-111: EPCOR Generation Inc. and EPCOR Power Development Corporation MW Genesee Pow Plant Expansion, Application 2001173, December 21, 2001, page 4.

21. In line with the above approvals, the Commission finds that the approval of the sale by the director of rural electrification associations provides support that the sale and transfer of the VNM REA's assets and operations is in the public interest.

22. Under Section 32(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, the Commission may transfer the service area of an REA that has been directed to cease operations under Section 29 or authorized to discontinue operation under Section 30, to another person. Section 32(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* states:

**Rural electrification association**

**32(1)** If a rural electrification association

- (a) under an order made under section 29,
  - (i) has the size of its service area reduced, or
  - (ii) ceases to operate in a service area or part of it, or
- (b) on being authorized under section 30 to do so, discontinues the operation of its electric distribution system, the Commission may, when in the Commission's opinion it is in the public interest to do so and on any notice and proceedings that the Commission considers suitable, by order transfer to another person the service area or part of it served by the rural electrification association.

23. When it has granted an order under Section 29, the Commission may, under Section 32(2)(a), provide for the transfer of the facilities of an REA, for the operation of an REA's electric distribution system, and for the payment of compensation.

24. For the above reasons, the Commission finds that the transfer of the VNM REA operations and related assets to Fortis is in the public interest. The Commission accordingly directs that the VNM REA operations and related assets be transferred to Fortis. The Commission also finds that it is appropriate for compensation to be paid and notes that the parties have agreed on the amount of compensation payable.

25. Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that it is in the public interest to grant the VNM REA's application to "cease to operate" in its service area pursuant to Section 29(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, provided that the facilities are transferred to, and operated by Fortis pursuant to the terms of the asset purchase agreement. Accordingly, the Commission directs the transfer of the VNM REA service area to Fortis pursuant to Section 32(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* and further directs the VNM REA to sell, and Fortis to purchase and operate, the VNM REA assets in accordance with the terms of the asset purchase agreement pursuant to Section 32(2) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*.

### 3.2 Stage two: prudence

26. The Commission must now assess the prudence of the purchase price to be paid by Fortis to the VNM REA.

27. Fortis submitted that the purchase price presented to the VNM REA membership was determined on the basis of RCN-D. The Commission has previously determined that the use of RCN-D is generally an acceptable valuation methodology for determining the purchase price to be paid when electric distribution utilities acquire the facilities of REAs.<sup>6</sup> As noted by the Commission in Decision [2013-296](#):

The Commission recognizes that the AUC has previously determined that the use of RCN-D is an acceptable valuation for the purchase of an REA by a Commission regulated utility in certain circumstances. In the Commission's view, to now deny the acceptability of RCN-D in the instant case, in the face of ample precedent that this valuation method has been accepted in the past, would be unfair to the parties to the REA purchase agreements.<sup>7</sup>

28. The circumstances of the application are consistent with prior approvals for the use of RCN-D for the determination of the purchase price to be paid. Accordingly, the Commission finds the purchase price to be paid by Fortis to VNM REA to be prudent.

### 3.3 Rate implications

29. The Commission also assessed the manner in which the purchase price might be included in the rates of Fortis.

30. On September 12, 2012, the Commission issued Decision [2012-237](#): Rate Regulation Initiative, Distribution Performance-Based Regulation (the PBR decision).<sup>8</sup> The PBR decision approved PBR plans for five distribution companies, for a five-year term commencing January 1, 2013. PBR replaces traditional cost-of-service regulation as the annual rate-setting mechanism for utility rates. The PBR framework provides a formula mechanism for the annual adjustment of rates independent of the underlying costs incurred by the companies. In general, the companies' going-in rates are adjusted annually by means of an indexing mechanism that tracks the rate of inflation relevant to the prices of inputs the companies use, less an offset to reflect the productivity improvements the companies can be expected to achieve during the PBR plan period. There are certain adjustments that distribution companies can apply for that provide treatment for certain costs not accounted for within the context of the indexing mechanism.

31. The Commission notes that although the VNM REA requested that the Commission direct Fortis to purchase its electric distribution system, Fortis has not applied for any adjustments to its rates from its acquisition of the VNM REA.

---

<sup>6</sup> Decision [2010-309](#): FortisAlberta Inc. 2010-2011 Distribution Tariff – Phase I, Proceeding 212, Application 1605170, July 6, 2011. Also, Decision [2013-296](#): ATCO Electric Ltd. - Rate Regulation Initiative, Performance-Based Regulation, Z Factor Adjustment Application, Proceeding 2301, Application 1609120, August 9, 2013.

<sup>7</sup> Decision [2013-296](#), paragraph 94.

<sup>8</sup> Decision [2012-237](#): Rate Regulation Initiative, Distribution Performance-Based Regulation, Proceeding 566, Application 1606029, September 12, 2012.

#### 4 Order

32. It is hereby ordered that:

- 1) The Commission approves the application of V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited to cease to operate in its service area, pursuant to Section 29(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, and grants to V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited the approval set out in Appendix 1 – Discontinuance of Distribution System – Approval 20733-D02-2015 – October 6, 2015. (Appendix 1 will be distributed separately).
- 2) The service area of V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited is hereby transferred to FortisAlberta Inc. pursuant to Section 32(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*.
- 3) The Commission rescinds Approval HE 75143, as amended, effective upon closing of the Asset Purchase Agreement.
- 4) V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited is directed to sell, and FortisAlberta Inc. is directed to purchase and operate, the electric distribution system of V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited in accordance with the terms of the Asset Purchase Agreement between V N M Rural Electrification Association Limited and FortisAlberta Inc., dated June 24, 2015, pursuant to Section 32(2) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, as set out in Appendix 2 – Sale and Transfer of Distribution System – Approval 20733-D03-2015 – October 6, 2015. (Appendix 2 will be distributed separately).

Dated on October 6, 2015.

#### Alberta Utilities Commission

*(original signed by)*

Anne Michaud  
Commission Member

## Appendix A – Standing ruling

[\(return to text\)](#)



Appendix A -  
Standing ruling.pdf

(consists of 7 pages)

September 24, 2015

To: Interested Parties

**FortisAlberta Inc.**  
**Sale and Transfer of the VNM Rural Electrification Association**  
**Proceeding 20733**  
**Application 20733-A002**

**Ruling on standing**

1. In this ruling, the Alberta Utilities Commission must determine whether to grant standing to EQUUS REA Ltd., Lakeland Rural Electrification Association Ltd., North Parkland Power REA Ltd. and Rocky Rural Electrification Association Ltd. (collectively, the intervening REAs) in the above-referenced proceeding.
2. For the reasons set out below, the Commission has denied standing to the intervening REAs. The Commission has instructed me to communicate its decision and its reasons to interested parties.

**Background**

3. The VNM Rural Electrification Association Ltd. (VNM REA) filed Application 20733-A001 with the Commission on August 13, 2015, requesting permission to cease and discontinue operations in its service area pursuant to sections 29 and 30 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. FortisAlberta Inc. (Fortis) filed Application 20733-A002 with the Commission on August 13, 2015, requesting approval for the sale and transfer of the VNM REA assets to Fortis effective November 1, 2015, pursuant to Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* (Fortis' application). The Commission issued a letter dated August 24, 2015, indicating that both applications would be considered in Proceeding 20733.
4. On August 17, 2015, the AUC issued a filing announcement which was automatically emailed to all eFiling System users that had chosen to be notified of filing announcements issued by the Commission. On August 24, 2015, the Commission issued a letter to Fortis and the VNM REA acknowledging receipt of the applications and outlining the anticipated review timeline.
5. On August 24, 2015, the intervening REAs jointly filed a statement of intent to participate on the record of Proceeding 20733 concerning Application 20733-A002.
6. Each of the intervening REAs is the owner of an electric distribution system in Alberta and is a rural electrification association (REA) as defined in the *Rural Utilities Act*. All of the intervening REAs operate within service areas that overlap the service area of Fortis, with the exception of Lakeland REA, whose service area overlaps that of ATCO Electric Ltd.

7. The intervening REAs sought intervener status on the basis that there are legal and policy oriented issues that are of a substantial and material interest to them. Specifically, they contended that they would be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's consideration of:

- The interpretation and application of the public interest considerations required under Section 32(1) [of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*] for the transfer of a service area of a rural electrification association to another person.
- The interpretation and application of Section 32(2)(b) [of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*], including provisions for the transfer of the facilities of a rural electrification association.
- The exercise by the Commission of its jurisdiction and discretion in respect of the foregoing.<sup>1</sup>

8. The intervening REAs also expressed concern that the Commission had not (as of the date of their submission) issued notice of the application and noted that no notice was provided for similar applications in the past that were approved under Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* for the sale and transfer of REAs to ATCO Electric Ltd.

9. The intervening REAs stated that the concerns expressed in this intervention are the same as those considered in Proceeding 20552. To that end, the intervention submission recommended that the Commission consider the issues in a joint proceeding of both proceedings 20552 and 20733. On August 25, 2015 the Commission issued a ruling that found that the intervening REAs did not have standing in Proceeding 20552 and that the issues raised would not be considered in that proceeding. Thus the Commission did not see the need to join the two proceedings.

### **How the Commission determines standing**

10. When determining standing, the Commission is guided by Section 9(2) of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, which states:

- (2) If it appears to the Commission that its decision or order on an application may directly and adversely affect the rights of a person, the Commission shall
- (a) give notice of the application in accordance with the Commission rules,
  - (b) give the person a reasonable opportunity of learning the facts bearing on the application as presented to the Commission by the applicant and other parties to the application, and
  - (c) hold a hearing.

11. If the Commission finds that a person has standing pursuant to Section 9(2) of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* it must hold a hearing to consider the person's concerns about the subject application. Further, persons with standing have the right to fully participate in the hearing. The Commission considers this to include the right to file evidence in support of their position, the right to question or cross-examine the applicant(s) on its evidence, and the right to make argument.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit 20733-X0027, page 2.

12. This provision and the factors to be assessed in determining whether to grant standing have been considered by the Alberta Court of Appeal.

13. In *Cheyne v. Alberta (Utilities Commission)*, the Alberta Court of Appeal confirmed the application of a two-part test for standing. First, a person must demonstrate that the right he or she is asserting is recognized by law. Second, a person must provide some information that shows that the Commission's decision on the application may directly and adversely affect his or her rights. The first part of the test is legal; the second part of the test is factual. For the factual part of the test, the Alberta Court of Appeal has stated that "some degree of location and connection between the work proposed and the right asserted is reasonable."<sup>2</sup>

14. In *Sawyer v. Alberta (Energy and Utilities Board)*, the Alberta Court of Appeal commented further on the factual component of the standing test and stated that "...in considering the location or connection, the Board is entitled to look at factors such as residence, the presence or absence of other wells in the area, and the frequency and duration of the applicant's use of the area near the proposed site."<sup>3</sup>

15. The Commission assesses the potential for direct and adverse effect on a case-by-case basis, having regard for the specific circumstances of each application. The expression of general or broad concerns about an application, without some link or connection to the demonstrated or anticipated characteristics of the applied-for application will generally be an insufficient basis for establishing the potential for a direct and adverse effect.

16. Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* articulates the Commission's role when a REA is sold and transferred to a utility.

17. Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* states:

**Rural electrification association**

**32(1)** If a rural electrification association

(a) under an order made under section 29,

(i) has the size of its service area reduced, or

(ii) ceases to operate in a service area or part of it,

or

(b) on being authorized under section 30 to do so, discontinues the operation of its electric distribution system,

the Commission may, when in the Commission's opinion it is in the public interest to do so and on any notice and proceedings that the Commission considers suitable, by order transfer to another person the service area or part of it served by the rural electrification association.

...

18. REAs are governed by the *Rural Utilities Act* under the supervision of the Director of Rural Electrification Associations for the Province of Alberta (Director of REAs).

---

<sup>2</sup> *Cheyne v. Alberta (Utilities Commission)*, 2009 ABCA 94.

<sup>3</sup> 2007 ABCA 297 at paragraph 16.

19. The sale of a REA to an investor-owned utility is governed by the provisions of Section 23 of the *Rural Utilities Act*, which provides as follows:

**Sale of works**

**23** An association may, by extraordinary resolution, authorize the sale of all its works to a utility company or to a municipality or Metis settlement.

20. The Commission has a broad public interest mandate but it is not equivalent to the public interest mandate exercised by the legislature. The Alberta Court of Appeal has confirmed that portions of the public interest may fall under the purview of the Commission whereas other portions of the public interest may be the responsibility of another government body. In *Maxim Power Corp. v. Alberta (Utilities Commission)*, the court stated as follows:

Considering the same issue twice does not minimize costs or make for effective regulation. Nor does the possibility of conflicting decisions. This result does not undermine section 5's other objectives. Rather, it simply means that the Legislature assigned the responsibility for determining one element of market efficiency (level playing field) to the Minister rather than to the Commission.<sup>4</sup>

21. In *Shaw v. Alberta Utilities Commission* ABCA 378, the Alberta Court of Appeal confirmed the following:

The Commission went on to note that, although the effect of the *Electric Statutes Amendment Act* was to transfer the first public interest determination to government as part of the need assessment, the Commission retains its jurisdiction to make the second public interest determination, whether the proposed facilities minimize, or mitigate to an acceptable degree, the potential adverse impacts on more discrete parts of the community: para 153. The Commission explained its view of the limits on its jurisdiction as follows, at para 154:<sup>5</sup>

22. The court at paragraphs 38 to 49 went on to state:

In a complex legislative scheme such as this one, it is necessary to have regard to the entire scheme in order to ascertain legislative intent. The interpretation adopted by the Commission and urged on us by the respondents, does not interfere with the harmonious operation of the various pieces of legislation that govern the Commission's approval of transmission lines. The Commission's interpretation is also in keeping with the operation of the legislative scheme in practice, and in particular the two-stage approach to new transmission developments established by the statutory scheme for non-critical infrastructure projects.

23. In Decision [2011-436](#),<sup>6</sup> the Commission articulated its role when deciding its public interest mandate:

... the Commission must not address the matters which the legislature has already addressed...

---

<sup>4</sup> *Maxim Power Corp. v. Alberta (Utilities Commission)*, 2010 ABCA 213 at paragraph 43.

<sup>5</sup> *Shaw v. Alberta Utilities Commission* ABCA 378 at paragraph 20.

<sup>6</sup> Decision 2011-436: AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc. – Heartland Transmission Project, Proceeding 457, Application 1606609, November 1, 2011, paragraph 160.

## Commission ruling

24. Unless the Commission chooses to exercise its discretion to allow parties to participate in its proceedings, a person seeking standing must demonstrate that there is the potential for a direct and adverse effect resulting from the Commission’s determination of the application before it.

25. With respect to the legal portion of the standing test, the Commission understands that each of the intervening REAs is asserting rights in respect to its electric distribution system. However, for the reasons that follow, Fortis’ application pursuant to Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* does not have the potential to directly and adversely affect the rights asserted by the intervening REAs. Fortis’ application, if approved, would increase its service area; however, this increase in service area would not overlap with any of the intervening REAs’ service areas. Accordingly, the increase in service area alone is insufficient to establish a connection between the application and the rights held by the intervening REAs.

26. The intervening REAs have sought to intervene in this proceeding to make submissions on legal and policy issues regarding the “high number of recent acquisitions of REAs by investor-owned Utilities in Alberta, and the transfer of purchased REA assets to such utilities”.<sup>7</sup> The Commission finds that the intervening REAs do not have a legal interest in broader policy considerations relating to the purchase of REAs by investor-owned utilities and over which the Commission has no jurisdiction. In addition, such legal and policy issues are too broad to establish a potentially direct and adverse effect on the intervening REAs as a result of Fortis’ application because the scope of Fortis’ application is restricted to the purchase of the VNM REA, and not to broader policy issues such as the “high number of recent acquisitions of REAs by investor owned Utilities in Alberta, and the transfer of purchased REA assets to such utilities.”<sup>8</sup>

27. The intervening REAs also assert that they are impacted by the Commission’s “interpretation and application of the public interest considerations” relating to Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. This is not the first time that the public interest under Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* has been considered by the Commission. For example, the Commission stated at paragraph 16 of Decision [20308-D01-2015](#):<sup>9</sup>

In assessing the public interest, the Commission has considered that the Stry REA’s assets and operations are located within ATCO Electric’s service area. The Commission has also considered and relied upon the agreement of ATCO Electric to continue to provide service to the members served by the Stry REA and to “operate, maintain, replace, reconstruct, alter or upgrade” the facilities it acquires. Further, the Commission observes that the Stry REA approached ATCO Electric to make a formal offer and that 75 per cent of the Stry REA’s members voted in favour of the sale.

---

<sup>7</sup> Exhibit 20733-X0027.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Decision 20308-D01-2015: Stry Rural Electrification Association – Application for Permission to Cease and Discontinue Operations and ATCO Electric Ltd. – Sale and Transfer of the Stry Rural Electrification Association, Proceeding 20308, Applications 20308-A001 and 20308-A002, May 21, 2015.

28. The current application is similar to Decision 20308-D01-2015 insofar as both the REA and the investor-owned utility had reached a mutual agreement for the sale and transfer of the REA's assets to the investor-owned utility. The Commission observes that neither Fortis nor the VNM REA has raised any issue with the interpretation and application of Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. Consequently, the Commission is not persuaded that further clarification of the application of Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*<sup>10</sup> is needed and that granting standing to the intervening REAs is required.

29. Further, the legal and policy considerations referred to by the intervening REAs are not matters to be considered by the Commission when it makes its public interest determination in considering Fortis' application. The legislature has retained jurisdiction over the sale of REAs and is responsible for determining whether, and on what terms, investor-owned utilities may purchase REAs. Based on the provisions of the *Rural Utilities Act*, the legislature has not placed restrictions on the number of REA acquisitions by investor-owned utilities. For the Commission to reconsider whether a REA may sell its electric distribution system and related assets to an investor-owned utility would be contrary to the legislation. The Commission's public interest mandate relates to the transfer of a REA's service area to another person such as an investor-owned utility and certain specific matters relating to the payment of compensation. A sale from a REA to a utility company is not automatically deemed to be in the public interest. The Commission's role is to ensure that distribution service will continue. As stated above, the legislature has reserved for itself the public interest as it pertains to the sale of REAs and has enacted Section 23 of the *Rural Utilities Act* in this regard.

30. The effect of Section 23 of the *Rural Utilities Act* and Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* is that any condition or term of approval imposed by the Commission must be for the purpose of ensuring the continued distribution of electric energy in the service area that was formerly served by the REA or other matters specified in Section 32(2) (such as the payment of compensation). To that end, the Commission may review the purchase and sale agreement and rely on the Director of REAs to confirm that all requirements of the *Rural Utilities Act* have been met when determining if the transfer of a service area is in the public interest under Section 32 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*.

31. With respect to the concern raised about notice, as described in Section 22 of Rule 001: *Rules of Practice*, if the Commission is considering making a decision on an application without a hearing, the Commission may issue a notice of application. Conversely, if the Commission considers that its decision or order would not directly and adversely affect the rights of a person pursuant to Section 9 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, it may elect not to issue a notice of application or require a hearing. When making its determination on notice, the Commission considers the nature of the application and whether the REA and the utility have consented to the sale and transfer. Fortis' application will not affect any other party's rights or interests in accordance with Section 9 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* given that both the VNM REA and Fortis have agreed to the sale and transfer of the VNM REA's service area to Fortis.

---

<sup>10</sup> See also Decision [2013-404](#), Decision [2011-238](#), Decision 2011-087, and Decision [2012-296](#).

32. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned at 403-592-4499 or [shanelle.sinclair@auc.ab.ca](mailto:shanelle.sinclair@auc.ab.ca).

Yours truly,

Shanelle Sinclair  
Commission Counsel