

From: Roger Rondeau <rrondeau@northwestel.net>

Date: March 9, 2023 at 8:19:55 AM GMT-7

To: Deana Lemke - YUB [yub@utilitiesboard.yk.ca](mailto:yub@utilitiesboard.yk.ca)

**Subject: Re: AEY-YEC Rate Rebasing - Written submission**

Dear Chair and Members YUB:

RE: Utilities Rate Rebasing

As we are not certain of Board deadlines etc. as we did not receive a copy of Board Order 2022-07, UCG will write a quick response to all the information received on this issue.

1. UCG sees from the info collected on this issue, that it is a faites accomplis where the utilities get just what they want yet again. Every time there is something they do not like, which could move us forward, it is out of scope.

2. Providing a gaggle of options and then stating only one is compatible, easy and less costly is an act in futility for interveners.

3. We are yet again missing a great opportunity to get things right for once. It is past the time that we get simultaneous

rate applications from the utilities so we can see exactly what it is costing ratepayers right now. Each filing their submissions when and if they want needs to be stopped. (Somewhere in the tombs of paper, the Board stated that rate applications should be filed every two years, but this has been conveniently blindsided by the utilities.) This is why ATCO did what they saw they could get away with, and to be blunt the Board let them do this for six years. A combined review would also afford the opportunity to unbundle generation, transmission and distribution revenues and costs for better transparency as well as to move forward to a Phase 2 process which is long overdue.

4. Much of this problem of added upon added rate adjustments would have been eliminated if each utility would have rolled in all old riders into the base rates each time there is/was a review. Instead they insist this is too difficult for them to do.

5. In our opinion, TOU and AMI adaptability is out of scope in this procedure. Ratepayers want to know exactly what we are paying for and our current bills/invoices do not give us this courtesy. Rather than focusing on how to implement a new and very costly program/system, the utilities should be more resourceful right now in their load shifting and peak demand conundrum. They can also apply seasonal rates.

6. The Fuel Rider is one of these riders that is controversial. The conundrum of Fuel Rider cost being extremely high right now would also be curtailed if the utilities would do what they preach...price adaptability so as to not give stress to the ratepayer at a given time, i.e ratepayer shock. This is accomplished by filing regular hearings with fuel price updates rolled into rates and then move forward with true ups for one year at time, not yearsssssss.

7. It does not appear to be logical nor fair to charge riders to the customer charge. It should only be on amount of energy used.

8. Although ATCO make it appear simple that estimated readings (and again this is billing) are okay and not due to lack of meter readers, these estimated readings then a true-up result in a skewed outcome for these various other riders on the billings.

Regards,

Roger Rondeau for UCG