**From:** Office of the Registrar
**To:** Zulma DeBonis
**Subject:** Redacted - Letter of Comment - EB-2026-0056
**Date:** Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:30:39 PM

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Ontario Energy Board <webmaster@oeb.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:24 PM
To: Office of the Registrar <Registrar@oeb.ca>
Subject: Redacted - Letter of Comment - EB-2026-0056

-- Name --
Hung Chieh Chen

-- Do you reside in the impacted service area? --
Yes

-- Comments --
I'm writing as a residential customer to share a few thoughts on London Hydro's proposed 2027 rate increase.

I understand that ongoing investment is needed to maintain a safe and reliable electricity system, replace aging equipment and keep up with London's growth. I also recognize that putting off necessary work can sometimes lead to higher costs later on.

At the same time, I think it is reasonable for customers to expect a clear explanation of why major investments are needed, why they need to happen now, what other options were considered, and what customers will ultimately receive for the additional cost.

The OEB indicates that, if the application is approved as filed, a typical residential customer using 750 kWh per month would pay about $6.01 more per month starting May 1, 2027. London Hydro also says its five-year plan includes average annual spending of approximately $37 million on equipment renewal and another $20 million on additional capacity and automation.

I'm not opposed to investing in London's electricity system. My concern is more about making sure the scale and timing of the spending are well supported, particularly when the costs will ultimately be passed on to customers.

For the larger investments, I would appreciate the Board looking closely at whether the work is needed within the proposed timeframe, whether less costly approaches or different phasing were considered, and whether the expected benefits to customers reasonably justify the cost. I think those are fair questions, particularly when affordability continues to matter for households.

I also noticed that London Hydro refers to its May 2026 customer engagement survey, saying that more than 12,000 customers participated and that 70% supported the proposed spending level or a higher level. London Hydro also says affordability feedback helped reduce the proposed typical residential impact from approximately $8 to $6.01 per month.

If those survey results are being considered as evidence of customer support, I would simply encourage the Board to look at the full context behind them, including how the questions were worded, what information and choices customers were given, and the underlying methodology and results. I think that context matters when interpreting a headline percentage.

Overall, I appreciate that there is a balance to be struck. London Hydro needs to invest enough to maintain reliable service and plan responsibly for the future, but customers also need confidence that the investments they are being asked to fund are necessary, reasonably timed and provide good value.

Thank you for considering my comments.

-- Was AI used for the letter of comment? --
Yes