

To: boardsec@ontarioenergyboard.ca

April 12, 2012

From: John Hubert

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: Applications for Smart Meter Cost Recovery File: EB-2012-0081

On Thursday March 29, 2012 the Burlington Post newspaper published the Burlington Hydro application, file EB-2012-0081, to recover costs of the Provincial mandated TOU meters. I understand that TOU can save the consumer some added expense if a lifestyle adjustment is made, but I have not received a TOU billing from Burlington Hydro as of yet, so I cannot do a comparison. I have viewed their on line TOU web site but that only reflects usage and costs and it is not an actual billing. These recovery costs and any future rate increases set by the OEB will continually increase costs and nullify those initial, if any, savings.

I am shocked; pardon the pun, at only recently becoming aware of the additional cost recovery expense. The entire public information process for the TOU scenario was adamant in encouraging energy savings for the consumer that would reduce peak power plant emissions and help reduce environmental pollution. When I built my home, I used a forced air electric system with a heat pump. Environmentally speaking, that put the onus to treat pollution back at the source. Residential and commercial oil and gas furnaces will continue to pollute. My environmental initiative receives no compensation with rising energy costs.

After checking the OEB website, I find that all energy providers can apply for increases to recover costs as outlined in OEB documentation that was legislated years ago. The energy providers involved in the TOU transition knew about this, but as far as I am aware, neither they, nor the OEB, nor others involved in the TOU scenario, ever openly attempted to mention this cost recovery publicly until after the fact.

To me, the public was deliberately misled and will now be required to pay additional expenses that they were not aware of. Regardless of fact that the legislated recovery costs are documented, the consumer would not normally peruse through thousands of documents that could possibly affect them in the future.

To me, the public information released to promote the TOU scenario was fraudulent from the start and at all levels of governance. Those involved should be ashamed and should be held accountable for their actions in deliberately misleading the public trust, especially with the non-disclosure of the cost recovery.

I feel that any cost recovery application by any service provider should not be allowed. I also feel that the public should not have to pay those recovery costs that were obscure and conveniently hidden from them.

I also feel that an official enquiry should be initiated into the actions of all parties involved in the promotion of the TOU scenario and that those parties should be held accountable and if necessary, prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, for deliberately misleading the public trust and underhandedly burdening the unsuspecting public with another expense that was in all aspects, contrived, manipulative and deceiving.

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the application.

Yours truly

John Hubert