

From: [BoardSec](#)
To: [Natasha Gocool](#)
Subject: FW: EB-2011-0354 Enbridge rate increase
Date: March 26, 2012 10:32:53 AM

From: Dennis O'Grady [REDACTED]
Sent: March 25, 2012 11:24 AM
To: BoardSec
Subject: EB-2011-0354 Enbridge rate increase

Not generally opposed to a cost of living, but the 3.2% seems a bit high.

Should look at company long-term profits to help determine if they need more money.

How do they define a "typical" house?

My bill does not show the total cu m of gas used/yr. I have to add up 12 bills. Not a big deal, but a running yearly total on the bill might be nice. The graph is just OK.

Enbridge application on-line is exceedingly difficult to read/understand. Maybe they have one done in plain English. Who knows? This site doesn't have one. The site is incomprehensible for the "typical" residential customer, who are, by the way, paying for this.

A ruling from the OEB to have a plainly written, 2 pager, done in a writing style that the "typical" household could read, would be useful. I suspect if this application were reviewed by someone familiar with writing, it would have an extremely high index.

I also think that the breakdown of the various charges is stupid (Delivery to you, delivery to Enbridge, gas supply, etc). It just gives Enbridge more room to raise the rates by saying "hey, it's not our fault!"

As long as the COLA is based on the total of all these charges, and each one is not fudged to give them more revenue, fine.

Dennis O'Grady
[REDACTED]