LETTER OF COMMENT 1

From:

Sent: September 19, 2010 12:26 AM

To: BoardSec

Cc: rgatien@wnhydro.com

Subject: Application EB-2010-0144 Waterloo North Hydro Inc.

To: Ontario Engergy Board

In regards to the application for Electricity Distribution rate change by Waterloo North Hydro, I am requesting that you take into consideration the following factors in your decesion.

- a) Waterloo North Hydro is owned by the City of Waterloo, and Townships of Wellesley and Woolwich. Prior to 2010, Waterloo North Hydro handled the billing of water services for The City of Waterloo on the same account and nvoice as hydro services that it provided. In 2010, this practice stopped with the City of Waterloo taking over billing for water separately. When the change occured, Waterloo North Hydro did not change its. Waterloo North Hydro states n Page 19 of 220 in the application document Waterloo_APPL_rates_20180827.PDF that one of the reasons for the increase is in order to offset a "loss in revenue in excess of cost decrease" meaning that Waterloo North Hydro is looking to replace the profits it has lost in no longer doing the water billing services for the City of Waterloo. This appears to be a conflict of interest considering Waterloo North Hydro is also owned by the City of Waterloo; meaning that customers in Waterloo would need to pay more for internal matters for the City of Waterloo.
- b) Also on the same page 19, Waterloo North Hydro states that it is seeking increases in order to offset capital assets that exceed depreciation levels. This 'deficiency' as described should not be offset by depreciation accounting practices but should be accounted for by increased efficiency in Waterloo North Hydro's operations; meaning they should see an improvement in operating costs or else the capital additions should not have been made. Decisions on increasing capital assets should not be made on the basis that they will be automatically covered by rate increases. These type of decisions should be made as in any other business based on good business sense.
- c) Waterloo North Hydro is asking for rate increases to cover economic wage increases. The Government of Ontario has requested that wages be frozen for the foreseeable future for Municipalities. Being that Waterloo North Hydro is owned by the City of Waterloo, the Ontario Energy board should not be approving such a change.
- d) Waterloo North Hydro in their documentation package shows figures that the rate increase will result in an improve rate of return for its holders and predicts that a portion of its rate increase will result in income taxes to be paid. This organization is again owned by the City of Waterloo. It should be considered to be an organization granted a monopolistic position in order to provide public services. This should not mean that rate increases should be granted to provide more profitability than current levels.
- e) On Waterloo North Hydro's website, there is information provided about the residential fees currently charged. The attached .jpg was taken from their website on September 18, 2010.

Under the dilivery charge section, several services are detailed that define what is included in the delivery charge. The current Distribution Volumetric charge paid by customers in 2010 amounts to \$.0132 / kwh where the proposed 2001 rate is \$.0202 / kwh, an increase of over 53%. This increase is outragous. The applicanats cost impact calculation shows a lesser percentage impact because they take into consideration percentages based on total cost of electicity including engergy, delivery, regulatory charges, debt retirement and HST. Of significant change is the applicants request to reduce the loss adjustment factor from 1.0505 to 1.0404 which lowers other costs charged to consumers; however the impact of the distribution volumentric charge increase is still a overall cost increase. The loss adjustment factors should be applied based on the actual data over the past few years which seems to merit a cost reduction to consumers based on a factor even lowere than 1.0404 as proposed. In effect, the board should reduce the lost adjustment factors to reflect actual history but not award the 53% increase on the distribution volumentric charge as this is outrageously high.



