

From: [BoardSec](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: OEB File # EB-2015-0179 Union Gas Limited
Date: September 18, 2015 4:30:37 PM

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September-18-15 4:24 PM
To: BoardSec
Subject: OEB File # EB-2015-0179 Union Gas Limited

September 18, 2015

Secretary,

Ontario Energy Board

Toronto, Ontario

Re: Union Gas Application File # EB-2015-0179

I write as an Ontario Senior and a customer and retired employee of Union Gas Limited.

I object in the strongest terms to this application that will transfer a portion of the costs for the expansion of Union Gas Limited into non-serviced areas thru a direct charge to it's current customer base in order to meet the investment pay-back formula as set out buy O.E.B. Decisions.

In part, my job with Union Gas prior to my retirement was directly involved in the expansion of our customer base through-out the Chatham-Kent and Sarnia service areas. I personally collected thousands upon thousands of customer "Aids-to-Construction" dollars that were assessed by the O.E.B. Formula for pay-back. All customers were required to pay their "Fair Share" for access to the pipeline. There are still a considerable number of farms and residences in rural Chatham-Kent that sit in close proximity to adequately sized distribution lines and are denied service without considerable contribution to the cost of the service line.

I was personally involved in the extension of gas service by Union Gas to the Chippewa reserve on the southern fringe of Sarnia in the late 60's. The customer base that Union Gas then enjoyed were NOT requested to HELP. To the best of my knowledge other than during the early 1990's when the Federal Government of the day was promoting consumers to switch from Oil to Natural Gas (Off Oil Program), this was the only time Union Gas did not directly collect the full amount of the monies required under the "Aid-to-Construction" formula from the potential customer requesting the natural gas supply. The Federal Government under their funding formula provided financial assistance directly to Union Gas in reducing the costs to most customers in an expansion area.

I think this proposal is a very discriminatory application of charges for the provision of Natural Gas service. All customers should be treated equal, if the Board in it's wisdom deems this application fair and non-discriminatory, then it should apply these provisions to all future applications for Natural Gas service regardless of the class of customer. However should the Board agree with me and Deny the application, they should direct Union Gas to seek financial support from the Federal departments that are involved in Aboriginal Affairs.

Respectfully,

J.Clare Curtis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]