

Feb 23, 2021.

Re: O.E.B. application from Hydro One's application to eliminate the Seasonal Rate Class.

Case # EB-2020-0246

I understand that with more extreme climate events and a change in energy demand caused by the changes in the types of structures being built currently, there is a need to upgrade the delivery infrastructure. However the proposed rate structure seems to me inordinately unfair, as low consumers of energy who are adequately supplied with the existing type and size of infrastructure are being asked to subsidize disproportionately the users requiring more electricity than the system's projected capacity.

We have 2 meters and 2 modest cottages on our property. We do not have winter access, and almost all of our consumption is mid June to mid September. Our yearly costs and usages for each cottage are as follows:

	<u>Cottage 1</u>		<u>Cottage 2</u>	
	<u>Usage</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>usage</u>	<u>cost</u>
2018	323 kwh.	536 ⁰⁰	854 k.	625 ⁰⁰
2019	386 kwh	557 ⁰⁰	812	626 ⁰⁰
2020	486 kwh	580 ⁰⁰	1218	664 ⁰⁰

2020 was atypical because of COVID, and not likely to be repeated.

Thus our total costs were for

2018	1161 ⁰⁰	for 1277 kwh.
2019	1206 ⁰⁰	for 1198 kwh.
2020	1244 ⁰⁰	for 1804 kwh.

According to Hydro One's proposal, FZ extrapolate correctly, our estimated annual electrical bill will be about \$2800⁰⁰ for 1200 kwh, an increase of about 240% (1200×2.4), whereas heavy users of power will be paying the same approximate delivery charge increase of \$55⁰⁰. Those of us with modest usage and seasonal access are subsidizing those building structures with the technology and appliances that year round occupancy requires. In our case we have a fridge and stove in each cottage, no other appliances, no air conditioning. Our bill is determined almost totally by the delivery charge and I realize it costs something to have the service available. But it is not cottages like ours pushing the upgrades. Our

transmission line was built in 1952 on a right of way that follows the lake along a ridge about 100' from the lakefront along the whole shore of our property, probably about 1500 feet. Wouldn't it be ironic if we went off grid with a line so close, with no benefit to be had, and with a probable relocation of the line should the property be developed at some point in the future, which we would like to prevent? Even with the proposed rate mitigation being phased in, when completed, if the scheduled rate classes are accepted, we are left paying essentially \$2.30 per kWh, with no way of reducing our cost without going off grid. This is not exactly a user pay system which should more closely reflect the actual amount of electricity being consumed.

Yours truly
David K. Armstrong