

**From:** DAFerkany Consulting (Denis Ferkany) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** March-08-17 5:38 PM  
**To:** BoardSec  
**Cc:** Mark Danelon; Natyshak, Taras  
**Subject:** EB-2016-0066 comments and OEB specific regulatory recommendations

To Whom It May Concern and /or Ms. Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary

My wife and I are residential customers of ELK Energy, in Essex, ON. Upon review [in part] of the rate increase request documentation EB-2016-0066, we are offering our support for the request. In addition, my review of the OEB process has generated specific comments for the OEB in general.

From our direct user experience, we find that ELK has a customer focus and provides adequate service to its customers. We do note that a specific capital project [in Viscount Estates] has been delayed since undertaken in 2015, in part due to underfunded personnel demands on ELK operations and manegment.

We believe that the rate increase, deployed substantially towards increasing personnel capacity, will allow ELK to maintain its current level of customer satisfaction, and increase those efforts as outlined in the application.

As noted, my review is "in part" regarding the application documentation. Upon visiting the OEB web site to review the application, I was confronted with more than 24 plus documents to sort thru. Though now retired, I spent my professional life writing, reviewing and implementing business plans. I found the amount of documentation required on behalf of the applicant to be extremely excessive.

And, given that providers in large jurisdictions and small such as ELK are all burdened with the same regulatory framework, this process represents an disproportionate and discriminatory burden on ELK.

In point of fact, a significant amount of the rate increase request is to manage the OEB imposed process. These are funds that directly detract from and reduce the ability of ELK to focus the maximum amount of its resources on maintaining its customer satisfaction focus and goals.

In addition, after wading through several documents in an effort to find a streamlined statement of plan, I gave up and called the ELK office in an attempt to get a copy of the presentation that was going to made at the March 2nd public meeting.

It was my impression from my inquiry, that the permission of the OEB was required to provide a copy of the presentation [hopefully a streamlined statement of the application]. It was my understanding that my request was made to the OEB. The request did not and has not resulted in a response.

My specific recommendations to the OEB, apart from the comments regarding the ELK application, are that:

- a "plain language" summary become part of the application process, and so as to not place further regulatory burden on applicants, that
- this summary be in the form of the presentation that will be made at the OEB public meeting regarding the application
- and that the presentation summary be made available for public review at least 30 days before the public engagement meeting, so as to provide adequate time to review and comment
- the OEB task a joint team of its personnel, applicant jurisdictions personnel [such as ELK] and interested public persons with the task of downsizing and streamlining the applicant regulatory process
- the OEB shall fund the regulatory applicant process from within its own existing budget [though a reimbursement mechanism to be identified], in which case streamlining the regulatory process will be in the OEB's own vested best self interest

I am available to provide further input or comment should it be assistance.

Regards, Denis

--

Denis A Ferkany [Retired]

Cell: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Skype: [REDACTED]

LinkedIn: [REDACTED]