

From: Webmaster <Webmaster@oeb.ca>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2019 2:18 PM
To: registrar <registrar@oeb.ca>
Subject: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --
2019-09-23

-- Case Number --
EB-2016-0315

-- Name --
James Fairhead

-- Phone --
[REDACTED]

-- Company --

-- Address --
[REDACTED]

-- Comments --

As a result of the recent activity on Implementation of the OEB Decision to eliminate the Hydro One Seasonal Rate Class, Hydro One Networks Inc. EB-2016-0315, I have reviewed Procedural Order 3 from September 17, 2019 and provide my comments as follows:

First, I applaud the work the OEB is doing!

Second, I find it very interesting the view presented by Hydro One Networks (HON) to date is one of concern for "large negative impacts on the majority of seasonal customers" as stated on Page 28 of the HON submission from July 19, 2019.

Furthermore, the e-notice provided to me as a HON subscriber says "On July 19, 2019, we submitted an updated report to the OEB, which demonstrates that eliminating this rate class would have a negative effect on more than half of our seasonal customers, which could result in a significant increase to their bills. Some seasonal customers could see their bills increase by about 129 per cent over the next several years – which could mean paying almost \$1,000 more a year."

Another way to say this is from my perspective as a subscriber is: "that eliminating this rate class would have a POSITIVE effect on LESS than half of our seasonal customers, which could result in a significant

DECREASE to their bills. Some seasonal customers could see their bills DECREASE by about 37% per cent over the next several years – which could mean SAVING almost \$2,600 more a year." (This amount, by the way, is my real savings today if I had been billed at R2 for the past 12 months - rather than the existing Seasonal rating.)

Is that any less true I ask just because I am paying too much? Is it any less important because I am paying too much? This HON positioning makes me feel that only subscribers NOT paying their current fair share have standing as subscribers and not the subscribers by-and-large paying for MORE than their fair share!

My final point at this time has to do with Figure 8 on page 16 of the September 2019 report. The Seasonal-R2 data is not logical when compared to the Seasonal-R1 and Seasonal-UR data. This is basic "sense test" stuff which doesn't pass - so I think mistakes have been made in the calculation on which we are reliant.

Can someone at HON address this for the benefit of all interested and affected parties so we know the logic from this moving forward is actually logical and correct? (I suspect Seasonal-R2 is actually using the monthly bill amount and the others are using the difference from the bill amounts).

thanks
james fairhead

-- Attachment --