

From: [registrar](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: CM: Letter of Comment - EB-2020-0246
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 6:36:50 PM

From: Webmaster <Webmaster@oeb.ca>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 2:47 PM
To: registrar <registrar@oeb.ca>
Subject: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --
2021-02-21

-- Case Number --
EB-2020-0246

-- Name --
Regina McIntosh

-- Phone --
[REDACTED]

-- Company --

-- Address --
[REDACTED]

-- Comments --
Case EB-2020-0246

I am contacting your office in response to a letter dated Feb. 21, 2021 from Hydro One, concerning the proposed changes for the seasonal rate class.

According to the information and example chart provided, since I am in the under 50 kWh category, my new annual cost would increase from \$540.50 to \$1369.56! I do not see how the "rate mitigation tool to protect consumers from having large bill increases at one time - for example, by phasing in the increase over a number of years" could possibly be a solution in this case.

I would like you to know that my primary residence in St. Catharines cost \$785.38 in 2020 for hydro. This is where I live all year!

In comparison, for the the 2 months of hydro usage at my seasonal residence, my annual cost was \$540.50, which is pretty steep already. So according to the upcoming plan, I would be charged \$1369.56 annually for only 2 months of use at our one season cabin?? That is almost double to what we pay at home for the entire year. How can this possibly be considered a decision that

"serve(s) the public interest. The OEB's goal is to promote a financially viable and efficient energy sector that provides reliable energy services at a REASONABLE cost"? This is definitely not reasonable.

We have owned our treasured one-season cabin since 1972, and have dealt with significant increases in cost in every area of taxes, insurance, utilities, and maintenance. This latest expectation to make changes because "distribution rates currently charged to seasonal customers do not appropriately reflect the cost to serve them" is an outrage and completely unfair to customers such as we, who fall into the lowest kWh usage (R2) class.

The proposed change puts the brunt of the increase on the owners with the least time spent at their seasonal locations. This expense definitely adds insult to injury.

Please reconsider the proposed calculation to truly reflect a fair increase.

An overall 10% hike could be accepted without undue stress, but the proposed rate is more than 100%! That is in no way a manageable increase which can be accommodated by phasing it in over a number of years!!

Your consideration and fairness is being asked for and needed in this alarming situation.

-- Attachment --