



Suite 410, 900 Howe Street  
Vancouver, BC Canada V6Z 2N3  
bcuc.com

P 604.660.4700  
TF 1.800.663.1385  
F: 604.660.1102

## Letter of Comment

In accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to submit a letter of comment concerning an application currently before the Commission, please provide a completed form to [commission.secretary@bcuc.com](mailto:commission.secretary@bcuc.com). If email is unavailable, please mail the form to the address above. By doing so, you acknowledge that all letters of comment are published with the author's name as part of the public evidentiary record, both in print copy and on the Commission's website. All personal contact information provided on this page is removed before posting to the website. Forms must be received by the Commission by the last filing date included in the proceeding's regulatory timetable before final arguments.

Proceeding name

Project No.1598915

Are you currently registered as an intervener or interested party?

No

Name (first and last)

John Selinger

City

Surey

Province

BC

Email

[REDACTED]

Phone number

[REDACTED]

# Letter of Comment

Name (first and last)

John Selinger

Date:

9/29/17

Comment: Please specify the reasons for your interest in the proceeding, your views concerning the proceeding, any relevant information that supports or explains your views, the conclusion you support and any recommendations. The Commission may disallow comments that do not comply with the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

I am writing to object to the City of Surrey's proposed operating fee. I do this for several reasons:

-I am a Surrey resident and customer of Fortis BC and therefore will experience a personal impact from the final Agreement.

-It has been very difficult to gain information to understand the differences between the City of Surrey and Fortis on this issue. Fortis BC has been informative and responsive; the City of Surrey has only directed me to uninformative general City webpages. Further, I note that the City of Surrey lawyers hoped to have no public input (awareness??) by asking the commission to rule without public consultation.... this effort appears subversive and not in the best interests of the residents of Surrey. It causes me great distrust of my elected officials.

-As best as I can determine, Fortis BC seeks a much lower 'collection' to accommodate infrastructure relocation (.7% of a portion of my bill) as compared to City of Surrey's 'collection' (3% of my total bill). This suggests that the City of Surrey wants to collect in excess of 400% more money from me than is needed to offset Fortis' estimated relocation costs.

-As the last Agreement extended for 60 years, it is important that the 'new' agreement be appropriate. If the City is allowed to overcharge and continue to do so, for decades, under a new agreement, the residents of Surrey will carry a non-sanctioned tax increase unfairly imposed.

-In this vein, if the City expects more money, they need to go to the taxpayers with financial statements, concrete plans and cost projections for that increased collection. It is unconscionable that the City of Surrey would attempt to 'tax' residents under the guise of the infrastructure relocation agreement rather than through referendums or election platforms. It seems that the City is attempting to use Fortis BC and the Utilities commission to obtain extra operating funds without accountability to the public. This is not what I expect from my 'representative' on city council.

-Obviously, with increased costs at every level of my life, I favor a lower fee but I am also a realist. If relocation costs are typically borne by various civil jurisdictions, (rather than developers, as an example), I understand that I would have to pay in some way. If FortisBC feels that .7% of a portion of my bill is adequate to service relocation costs, I cannot support City of Surrey's call for 3%.