

From:

From: Webmaster <Webmaster@oeb.ca>

Sent: Saturday, March 6, 2021 1:24 PM

To: registrar <registrar@oeb.ca>

Subject: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --

2021-03-06

-- Case Number --

EB-2020-0246

-- Name --

Michael Johnston

-- Phone --

-- Company --

-- Address --

-- Comments --

Ontario Energy Board Hearing to consider next steps in eliminating Hydro One Network Inc.'s Season Rate Class (EB-2020-0246)

I am writing to voice my disappointment with the decision by OEC/Hydro One to eliminate seasonal rates for cottage owners. Although this was tabled in 2015, the timing of the decision to roll this out, during a pandemic, shows how insensitive and out touch with consumers OEB/Hydro One truly are. Many are struggling to stay employed and hang on to their family retreat, yet OEB/Hydro One announced the timing of the roll out during this emotionally challenging time.

I am the owner of a seasonal cottage that will fall into the residential density (R2) class. As such I will see my delivery charge double with this proposed increase. To put that in perspective, in 2020 the total distribution cost I paid was \$661 while electrical usage was \$238. That's almost a 3:1 ratio whereas under the new rate it will increase to 6:1. This distribution to usage ratio far exceeds the ratio of any other utilities we deal with.

It's understood the new rate will be delivered incrementally, with 10% increases year over year until fully implemented. However, a 10% increase far exceeds cost of living increases and would be challenging for those on fixed incomes. To make matters worst, under the new rate systems, some will have their distribution rate reduced. Surely more effort could have been put into a balanced approach that offset losses with gains and delivered increases that aligned with the cost of living.

As I understand it, distribution costs are based on the number of users per specified area or distance. Given the lower density associated with cottagers the rationale would be, there are fewer people to share the cost of maintaining the infrastructure. But I would argue with lower density comes lower power demand, meaning transformers and other infrastructure would be appropriately sized to need. This should represent lower infrastructure costs where

equipment is appropriately sized to demand loads.

Regards,
Mike Johnston