

From: [seasonalrateclass](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: CM: Letter of Comment - EB-2020-0246
Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021 9:35:40 PM

From: Webmaster <Webmaster@oeb.ca>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 10:04 AM
To: registrar <registrar@oeb.ca>
Subject: Letter of Comment - [REDACTED]

The Ontario Energy Board

-- Comment date --
2021-03-15

-- Case Number --
EB-2020-0246

-- Name --
Mark Kostelnik

-- Phone --
[REDACTED]

-- Company --

-- Address --
[REDACTED]

-- Comments --

RE: Elimination of Hydro One Seasonal Rate Class Reference EB-2020-2046 We are writing in connection with your proposal, reference as above, to change the structure of billing for electrical power users in rural Ontario. This is as advised to us by letter from Hydro One dated February 11, 2021.

We are families that own seasonal property on Rice Lake and we have serious concerns about eliminating Seasonal Rate Class. We utilize these properties for summer weekend recreations purposes, and summer vacations. Before cottaging, we were avid campers and not fans of flying overseas for vacations that support other economies, outside of local. On our strip, Cottagers are hard working people including many Seniors who have worked hard their entire lives, and by cottaging they in turn keep economies of smaller Canadian towns also working. Essentially, cottagers truly support local. Raising fees will impact affordability and impact local economies.

Does the Board recognize that seasonal properties are indicated on our MPAC statements? Therefore, how could Hydro request to “eliminate a class”?

To not recognize or acknowledge this class that has existed historically, seems peculiar. Our cottage on a private road, and does not have access in winter to the road (unless someone would make such an arrangement and pay for it themselves as the city is not taking care of over 2km stretch of road, and we have no access to municipal infrastructure). These points illustrate that we are truly seasonal cottagers.

The typical cottage owner in our area, are the working class. Recreation should be accessible to all income levels, and with what Hydro is proposing – seems to put cottaging more out of reach for the public.

Hydro poles already exist in the area due to farmers and local residents that Hydro merely has to extend its service to a few seasonal cottages. The infrastructure exists, and in our opinion proposing different classes seems

to imply cottage owners are to start subsidizing local residents use. Our average summer usage is low. For the unused winter, Hydro sends us “delivery fees” on our bill, meanwhile we have zero (0) kWh consumption. This in itself is absurd. In my opinion, we are contributing to the payment of mismanagement of past company decisions, and this current proposal is again a sign of bad management internally within Hydro One which they are trying to pass on to consumers. Enough is enough. Better oversight of Hydro One to ensure they are taking accountability for decisions and operations of the company, would be a good recommendation coming from the Board rather than raising fees.

Hydro One’s proposed changes are a path to future increases, instead of true solutions such as finding efficiencies or innovation to assist sustainability. Where are other models available to seasonal users, such as low rates or off the grid options that are more sustainable?

Overall, we contest the Hydro One proposal. No blanket increase of this magnitude should be made by a government body without due consideration to the circumstances of the individual users, and also the community as a whole, seasonal or not.

Sincerely,

Anna & Mark K. [REDACTED]

Marianna & Paul D. [REDACTED]