



**bcuc**  
British Columbia  
Utilities Commission

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

FortisBC Energy Inc. and City of Surrey Applications for Approval of Terms for an Operating Agreement ~ Project No.1598915

Are you currently registered as an intervener or interested party?

No

Name (first and last)

Gregory Udy

City

[REDACTED]

Province

BC

Email

[REDACTED]

Phone number

[REDACTED]

# Letter of Comment

Name (first and last)

Gregory Udy

Date:

27-Oct-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 disappointed in the 4 page mailing I received from Fortis, covering letter dated July 19th, 2017. The mailing is confusing and not structured in a manner, and with the brevity required, to allow the reader to quickly grasp it's message.

I am disturbed by the fact that I received no communication of any kind from The City of Surrey relating to this important application, potentially very costly for Fortis users in Surrey, most of whom are also Surrey tax payers. This immediately made me suspicious that The City of Surrey was attempting to "sneak something past me". After further investigation, I am reassured that my gut instincts served me well.

Allowing The City of Surrey to collect 3% of every Surrey Tax payer's Fortis bill is tantamount to permitting circumvention of proper City of Surrey budget approval process. What is the fiscal plan and budget? Where is the obligation to properly inform Surrey Tax payers? Fortis suggests that costs can be covered for less that 1%, and it has the math to backup it's statement.

Much of the proposed new operating fee is to be used to pay for new construction. You have to have your head buried in the sand to not know how well developers are doing in The Lower Mainland's BOOMING real estate market - including Surrey's. These developers should bear the brunt of proposed costs, not Joe homeowner.

Further, Surrey is one of the fastest growing Cities in Canada, with a proportionally expanding tax base. Yet it cannot find other ways to cover the proposed cost?

I spoke over the phone to a City of Surrey lawyer about this issue. His name was Anthony Capuccinello. To justify the proposed 3%, he used the Kinder Morgan pipeline as an analogy. Anthony argued that Surrey should not be expected to pay additional costs to service expand and upgrade Surrey roads and highways coming about due to the presence of a Kinder Morgan pipeline lying beneath or adjacent. I agree. However, Surrey tax payers are not shareholders in Kinder Morgan and we don't consume the flow in it's pipeline. We reap no profit or benefit, so why should we pay? The analogy is off base.

If The City of Surrey is proposing what amounts to a tax increase, then allow the electorate to vote on the proposal in the next election. Incumbent politicians like to state in their stump speeches, "We have not raised taxes and promise not to!" Then, all too often, behind the scenes they try to pull off this kind of stunt. Shame on you City of Surrey. In my humble opinion Christy Clark lost the last Provincial

election because she liked to rob Peter to pay Paul, the main example being: raiding ICBC's profits to subsidise general tax coffers. And make no assumptions about my political leaning; I'm a conservative. The BC Liberals simply became too arrogant, They shot themselves in the foot. I refuse to quietly accept this type of behaviour from my local government. The public doesn't want contrived funding plans designed to hide true cost allocations. What we need is fiscal responsibility and accountability. Above all, we need **fiscal transparency**.

Gregory Udy,  
30 year Surrey homeowner and (prompt) tax payer