

[REDACTED]

From: registrar
Sent: Monday, April 9, 2018 2:38 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HPE CM: EB-2017-0049 FW: Letter of Comment -

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: peter bryan-pulham [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 7, 2018 11:48 AM
To: registrar <registrar@oeb.ca>
Subject: Re: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

Simply adding to the insult!!

Regarding the invoice I received for my mother's property identified in the e-mail below, I just noticed a pamphlet that was included called "A fresh new look to serve you better" the example bill shows a total bill of \$144.77 total with taxes for a property using 1000 kwh per month. the breakdown for one month, electricity use is \$82.62 and the delivery is \$86.03 before taxes. The percentage breakdown of the two charges equals 49% for electricity and 51% for delivery. This really shows there is a big difference when comparing to a seasonal resident to a permanent resident.

The promise to equalise the two teared cost difference between seasonal and residential should not take years to resolve. I would gladly accept a ratio close to 50% if indeed the example does represent any truth to the real scenario.

I hope this discussion comes up during the review to impose a date when this will occur.

From: peter bryan-pulham [REDACTED]
Sent: April 7, 2018 11:08 AM
To: registrar
Subject: Re: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

Case File ; EB-2017-0049

To continue with my point, I am in receipt of the hydro bill for my mother's cottage for the period of Dec 16/2017 to March 21/18 which is apparently still read in person despite the fact a smart meter is installed. The hydro used is \$0.00 and yet the delivery charge is \$111.63 before taxes. Under the explanation of delivery it is indicated that "**A portion of this cost is fixed and a portion varies depending on the amount of electricity used**". If this is true, I can only conclude that the bill received is the fixed portion of this bill.

Referencing the previous bill below in my e-mail dated January 1,2018, " if the statement in bold is true " that means when comparing the \$111.63 in fixed cost you can subtract this amount from the total of \$178.11 before taxes which equals \$66.48 of additional delivery charges for the hydro use of \$54.79 before taxes.

Basically ,we paid an additional cost of \$66.48 before taxes for the delivery of the hydro used. Mathematically this means the price of delivery equals 121% more than the price of hydro used. This is simply called double dipping and doesn't make sense to me especially when they boldly apply for an increase in delivery charges to be applied for a period of 4 years if I am not mistaken.

The smoke and mirror's need to stop!!! By application of Hydro One's request for an increase in delivery charges need's to be declined followed by a full auditing of their financial plans which includes wages and proposed increase's especially for upper management.

I appreciate the opportunity to be involved in what I hope to be a decision to decline Hydro One's application for increasing their delivery charges. I am still interested in knowing the cost percentage for wages included in the delivery costs.

From: peter bryan-pulham [REDACTED]
Sent: January 1, 2018 1:30 PM
To: registrar
Subject: Fw: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

Case File : EB-2017-0049

To further prove a point , I am in receipt of the year end hydro bill for my mother's cottage. The hydro used before taxes is valued at \$54.79 for the period of Sept. 20 to Dec.16/2017. The delivery charges before taxes is valued at \$178.11. Percentage wise the delivery charges represent 76.5% of the bill before taxes.

This bill indicates that under the Ontario's Fair Hydro Plan my mother saved \$45.32. There is a note that suggest's this statement is easier to read and understand. I really cannot find any where in the statement that indicates where this dollar amount comes into play or a calculation of how the savings identified is applied to the bill.

My biggest concern is that if the Energy Board approves the requested increases submitted to the delivery charges over the years, how much of the savings identified will be impacted by these increase's. As a consumer, these types of details should be easily identified on the bill which brings me back to the previous paragraph.

If I am correct, these increases as asked for by Hydro One will negatively affect the so called savings relief provided by the Ontario's Fair Hydro Plan therefore should be denied!!!!!!

NOTE: I did notice that the explanation provided on the invoice for delivery charges does not identify "wages" as part of the cost. In fact this subject is not identified at all. I personally would like to know how much percentage wise of the invoice I receive makes up for the wages overall.

P.S. As a suggestion perhaps Hydro One should consider a freeze to any increases in wages , especially upper management, over the years identified in their application for increasing delivery rates. This would help to dispose of their financial difficulties as opposed to passing this burden simply onto their customer's. Just something for the Board member's to seriously consider as opposed to approving their request.

From: peter bryan-pulham [REDACTED]
Sent: September 26, 2017 11:06 AM
To: [REDACTED]

Case File :EB-2017-0049

Further reasons to consider denying this application to increase Delivery fee's.

Admittedly ,Hydro One has the highest delivery fees than any other hydro supplier. Their excuse, they provide hydro to rural Ontario and it appears this hardship is to be paid for by urban customers. This is unfair when considering the Towns and Cities that Hydro One has taken over have seen their bills rise significantly for the delivery of hydro over night. This despite the fact that Hydro One should have realised a plan to provide for distant locations within its own budget prior to these take overs. I am sure they are subsidised for this hardship by the government some how. Please make them be more accountable for their business plan especially now with shareholder's involved please.

Seasonal properties vs Residential properties , Hydro One admits that seasonal properties pay more than residential as I have e-mails that confirm this that I can share with you if necessary. Apparently they have been working on equalising this but it will take several years. I believe their solution is to bury this amalgamation of the difference in cost by simply applying for increases in delivery charges which it seems all applications are rubber stamped. The problem ,including the latest application to increase the delivery fee's; there is still no assurance residential rates will be applied to seasonal residences. Perhaps because they wish not to decrease the seasonal rate's to residential rates but have full intention to continue to increase residential rates until they can afford to drop seasonal rates once residential rates get high enough so as to not have a negative impact on their over all income and loose this cash cow at the present time. This should be investigated !!!!!

Seasonal properties also are given an alter-madame when it comes to reducing the cost of hydro use and delivery when it comes to winterising a cottage i.e. Pay for a disconnect and a reconnect during this period or shut the main breaker down. Both essentially do the same thing; using no hydro for those month's however requiring to pay a delivery charge for nothing. Basically the fees related to a disconnect and reconnect are more than paying a delivery charge for no hydro being provided by shutting down the main breaker. There is something wrong with a system where you pay or pay for the same outcome no hydro being used. The alternative is to keep your hydro on to warm the cottage just above freezing by using the highest of energy saving devices. The result you pay significantly more in delivery charges than hydro used. Their answer , you haven't used enough hydro to bring the percentage difference down between hydro used vs delivery charges. This latest request in front of the OEB is a slap in the face. The OEB should require an explanation for this scam.

There apparently seems to be no boundaries of control over this companies financial plan. Please stand up for the consumers for once.

From: peter bryan-pulham [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2017 1:11 PM
To: Ontario Energy Board
Subject: Re: Letter of Comment [REDACTED]

In addition to my letter below for the purpose of further evidence the Hydro One bill received this period for the property of concern is \$258.93 . To break this down \$69.43 is the cost for kwh used before taxes and the delivery plus regulatory charges equals \$177.17. Percentage wise 26.8% of the bill is for hydro used and 68.4 % is delivery. Standard answer from Hydro One is we didn't use enough hydro and that is why are bill shows such a difference percentage wise. people have been lead astray by implementing more hydro efficient devices only to be punished by higher delivery charges. Please consider this as additional supportive information to deny the request from Hydro One. This application by hydro one is suspicious considering the freeze that has recently been promised.

From: webmaster@ontarioenergyboard.ca <webmaster@ontarioenergyboard.ca> on behalf of Ontario Energy Board <webmaster@ontarioenergyboard.ca>

Sent: June 12, 2017 11:34 AM

[REDACTED]

Thank you for submitting a letter of comment to the Ontario Energy Board. We will hold a public hearing before making a decision on this application. Your letter will be given to the decision-makers for this case. Your comments will be taken into consideration as long as they relate to issues in the case and are within the Ontario Energy Board's legal authority to decide.

You will receive a copy of our decision when it is released.

For privacy reasons, we keep only your full name on the letter. We remove any other personal and contact information. The letter with your full name and your comments will then become part of the public record. This means that it will be posted on our website and will be available at our offices for the public to review. If you want the applicant to respond to your letter, you need to send a copy directly to the applicant because your address and other contact information will be removed from the public copy at the Ontario Energy Board.

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --
2017-06-12

-- Case Number --
EB-2017-0049

-- Name --
Peter Bryan-Pulham

-- Phone --

-- Company --

-- Address --

-- Comments --

The latest bill March 27/2017 received included a statement declaring OEB authorized a reduction in distribution rates. Further costs went down 8% the HST. This was good news until now! June 1/2017 announcement application for distribution rates to rise? The rate increases will not just nullify the latest effort to reduce the high cost of the overall delivery costs but will effectively eliminate the provincial efforts as well. I cannot believe that the OEB is even considering such an application understanding that Hydro One has the highest delivery rates than any other supplier. This should not be considered an application for a raise but an act of greed to please the share holder's since selling off hydro one to the private sector. My mother 82 years old who only owns a cottage and lives with my sister after closing the cottage down for the winter months received a hydro bill for this period for \$123.02. Broken down \$1.54 cents of kwh used and the balance is \$113.41 cents for delivery plus 0.88 cents Regulatory fees before taxes equates to the delivery being 98.7% of the bill. Any increases approved by the OEB will eliminate the latest effort to reduce costs for all residence's served by Hydro One. The main page attached to this bill announces "Delivery Rates are Decreasing" includes a move to all-fixed distribution rates. By approving this application the board is essentially going against a promise made by Hydro One. In fact, Hydro One is breaking their own promise to reduce cost to their client's. I hope this message from a concerned client of Hydro One does not fall on deaf ears!!!!!!

P.S. the previous bill to the one above , total \$255.97 - \$62.09 kwh cost=\$193.88 equates to delivery being 75.7% of the bill.

To put this into perspective , in Tillsonburg the hydro used equals 2/3 of the bill and delivery is 1/3 (33.3%) of the bill.

Read over the letter from Mayo Schmidt "To our valued customers"

This electronic transmission, including any accompanying attachments, may contain information that is confidential, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law, and is intended only for the recipient(s) named above. Any distribution, review, dissemination or copying of the contents of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and permanently delete the copy you have received.

Ce message, transmis par courriel, y compris tout fichier joint, peut contenir des renseignements qui sont confidentiels, qui sont protégés par le secret professionnel ou qui ne peuvent être divulgués aux termes des lois applicables et s'adressent exclusivement au(x) destinataire(s) indiqué(s) ci-dessus. La distribution, la diffusion, l'examen ou la reproduction du contenu du courriel par une autre personne que le(s) destinataire(s) voulu(s) sont strictement interdits. Si vous recevez ce message par erreur, veuillez le supprimer définitivement et en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement par retour du courriel.