

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Letter of Comment
Date: June 27, 2017 12:56:15 PM

Original Message-----

From: webmaster@ontarioenergyboard.ca [<mailto:webmaster@ontarioenergyboard.ca>]
Sent: June-14-17 1:03 PM
To: registrar
Subject: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --
2017-06-14

-- Case Number --
EB-2017-0049

-- Name --
Juliusz Grodski

-- Phone --
[REDACTED]

-- Company --

-- Address --
[REDACTED]

-- Comments --
To the OEB:
Re: EB-2017-0049 Hydro One Increase application

I am very concerned with the Hydro One (HO) application with respect to the increases in the distribution rates since I do not see a wholistic approach in this application, specifically in view of the HO expectations of "moving to fixed distribution rates", signalled on the HO web site.

This simply sounds like:

give me the increases for the fixed distribution service charges now, and later we will reveal to you what we want for the distribution volume charges, and then, most likely, also let us have "adjustment factors" everywhere so we can fix (grab) WHATEVER else we may wish to do/take.

This is a blatantly NON-TRANSPARENT (typical) way of the utility ways and for one, I object to it, and, yes, I hope, that one day soon, the OEB will also see to the machinations and responds accordingly.

Moreover, the proposed rates go significantly beyond what the consumer index would suggest, as it has been the case for so many years now. Which begs the

question: when will HO live to the reality of the day, just as we all ratepayers have to do?

There ought to be limits to this money grab practice, publicly declared by Hydro One with their intention to pay 70% to 80% of their net income as dividends to shareholders!

We, consumers, hope that OEB can bring some sanity to applicant's practices in these areas.

While the application appears generic in terms of the rate increase, making use of the "typical residential consumer" verbiage, the question is what the details are? and that is where the "devil" usually resides; i.e. the question is how the "average" would play itself in terms of practical application of the increase to the different residential classes including the seasonal one, and I suspect, as usual, seasonal class will emerge to be the scape goat in being burdened the heaviest.

Once again, that would be an unfair move, continuing further enhancement of disparity between the user classes, a very undemocratic move. We hope that OEB can play a positive control role in preventing this from taking place.

It is suggested that OEB acts on its decision dated March 12 2015

(EB-2013-0416) that "the OEB is not convinced that the load characteristics of seasonal customers are sufficiently different from their neighbours in the residential classes to justify the continuation of the class".

We all request for OEB to stand as a guardian of fair practices for Ontario utilities, while having the Hydro One energy consumer's well being (should I say "survivability"?) in mind as the primary objective.

-- Attachment --