

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: January 12, 2011 6:30 PM
To: BoardSec
Subject: Cost Eligibility EB-2010-0377/0378/0379

Ms. Walli: Following and attached in OpenText is my letter in respect to the captioned. Please note that I have today mailed three copies of the below letter.

Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Attention: Board Secretary
Tel: 1-877-632-2727 (toll free)
Fax: 416-440-7656
E-mail: Boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca

January 12, 2011

Dear Ms. Walli,

RE: EB-2010-0377, EB-2010-0378, EB-2010-0379: Cost Eligibility

I write to the Board as a ratepayer in respect to the request by the following for "cost eligibility" as noted in the OEB posting of January 10, 2011:

- [Association of Power Producers of Ontario](#) (EB-2010-0377; EB-2010-0379)
- [Council of Canadians](#) (EB-2010-0377; EB-2010-0378; EB-2010-0379)
- [Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario](#) (EB-2010-0377; EB-2010-0378; EB-2010-0379)
- [School Energy Coalition](#) (EB-2010-0377; EB-2010-0378; EB-2010-0379)

I wish to object to the above being granted "cost eligibility"!

My objections are based on the fact that three of the above entities represent organizations who already receive funding or revenues or receive their paychecks and benefits as a direct outcome of monies paid by either ratepayers, taxpayers or both.

In the case of the Council of Canadians, it should be noted that they are an advocacy group who seek to change legislation as it applies to the energy sector in all of Canada including Ontario and as such should focus their views on the various political parties not on the entity having responsibility for managing the legislation under the acts and regulation outcomes.

I will elaborate hereunder on each of the four (4) parties named above.

Association of Power Producers of Ontario: (APPrO)

APPrO has over 100 members, with more than 30,000 MW in Ontario and tens of thousands more worldwide. To name just a few, there are:

Northland Power, TransAlta, Ontario Power Generation Inc., SITH Energies, Great Lakes Power, Bruce Power, AES Tractebel, Calpine

All of the APPrO members and many of the associate members benefit from revenue sources that come directly from ratepayers and taxpayers, many are crown corporations, and many are involved in lobbying the government. ApprO and its members and associate members have the wherewithal to absorb the costs associated with their participation in these hearings without the need to receive further support from the ratepayers and taxpayers of this province. Many of the members of APPrO will be substantial participants in this process and APPrO will have the capability of ensuring they are able to obtain feedback and dissipate it to their members as they deem it appropriate. For that reason it is not necessary for APPrO to participate as an intervenor but I do not object as long as they are not granted "cost eligibility" status.

For the foregoing reasons their request for cost eligibility should be denied by the OEB.

Council of Canadians:

The Council of Canadians admits that it is an advocacy group yet the organization cannot be found on the Ontario Lobbyist Registry. Their 2009 annual report claim they received donations of over \$4.5 million dollars. They take their advocacy seriously and travel extensively around the world to Copenhagen, to Cancun and right across Canada. They produce research reports, videos, brochures, etc. all to support their advocacy issues and presumably at a cost they are able to absorb. The OEB was established to administer and regulate the electricity sector in this province, not to be influenced by advocacy groups that wish to change or alter existing legislation. As such the Council of Canadians cannot offer any pertinent issues to the matters to be examined by the Board and should not be eligible for costs.

As a ratepayer I have no problem with their participation but the taxpayer or ratepayer should not be burdened with any costs that they incur.

Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario:

The Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario consists principally of various locals of the IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) who are generally employed by the same generators and distributors, etc. that are members of APPrO. We note that the PWU (Power Workers Union of Ontario) has also requested intervenor status on the captioned matters but did not request "cost eligibility" yet the Electrical Contractors Association have. If the PWU are able to cover their costs shouldn't this association? Again, as a ratepayer I have no problem with the Electrical Contractors Association acting as an intervenor but I object to their request for "cost eligibility".

With thousands of members paying dues they can easily afford to cover their costs on these matters.

School Energy Coalition:

The School Energy Coalition claims to represent the interests of all Ontario publicly-funded schools in matters relating to energy regulation, policy, and management. It is made up of all seven of the major school-related organizations, representing all of the school boards, and all levels of school management, and through them representing the approximately 5000 schools and about 2 million students in Ontario. The Ontario 2010 budget allocated taxpayer monies of \$21.4 Billion as the Education budget and yet they are seeking cost eligibility from the ratepayers & taxpayers of this province. It would behove the School Energy Coalition to use a tiny portion of those funds for their intervention for this matter rather than seeking further monies from the residents of Ontario. I am confident that the 5000 schools would be capable of finding say \$10/15.00 each out of their respective budgets to cover the Coalition's costs on this matter.

For the foregoing reason I object to the School Energy Coalition's request for "cost eligibility".

The OEB should respect the capacity of ratepayers/taxpayers to continue to absorb additional costs from entities, both public and private, that already receive Billions of dollars from those same ratepayers and taxpayers. These applicants need to understand that the public must budget to cover their needs and any entity that receives its funding and revenues from the public should do the same by ensuring their budget allows for contingencies such as the ones before

the Board..

Respectively yours,

A. Parker Gallant

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

Your Carbon Footprint, Please Think Before You Print.