

Date Submitted: September 28, 2019

Proceeding name: BC Hydro CCF Pilot – Year One Evaluation Report

Are you currently registered as an intervener or interested party: No

Name (first and last): Mike Steiner

City: Mara

Province: British Columbia

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone number:

Comment:

I am submitting this comment because I do not think BC Hydro customers should be forced into paying into what is basically a social program. Hydro customers are already subject to an overwhelming amount of taxes in this country. Please see attached comment letter.

Comments on CCF One Year Review

September 28 2019

Please include these comments in the "Customer Crisis Fund" review.

BC Hydro is in the business of supplying and distributing electricity and the Commission is responsible for approving rates for that service.

By all definition, the "Customer Crisis Fund" falls into one or more of the following categories:

- a) it is an insurance product
- b) it is a charity
- c) it is a tax

Neither BC Hydro nor Commission has the authority to implement this charge because:

The Customer Crisis Fund is:

- a) not a service
- b) unrelated to supply and distribution of a power

and:

Neither BC Hydro nor the Commission is in the business of or has the authority to:

- a) provide and sell any type of insurance, including bill payment insurance
- b) create and mandate its customers pay a new tax
- c) mandate its customers to donate to any charity, let alone one determined by BC Hydro or the Commission

Further to the above BC Hydro has an obligation to manage its accounts receivable and collect from its debtors all amounts owing as any prudent business or crown corporation should.

Another obvious and compelling argument against this charge is the fact the Provincial Government of BC already offers a Hardship Assistance program. The Provincial Government is the only authority that should be implementing any type of "Hardship Assistance" programs. These types of programs certainly should not, and do not, fall under the purview individual utility companies or the Utility Commission.

This extraordinary overreach of authority of the BCUC must be corrected.

For all of the above reasons this charge is unjust and unreasonable and as such should not have been implemented as per section 59 (5) (c) and section 60 (1) (i) of the Utilities Commission Act. This charge should be rescinded and all money collected returned to its rightful owners.

Thank You

Mike Steiner