September 14, 2020

Mayor Alar Soever and Council
Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street
Thornbury, ON  N0H 2P0

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: Appointments to the BIA Board of Management

At the September 2, 2020 meeting of the board the following motion was passed:

   THAT the Thornbury Business Improvement Area Board nominates BIA members Stephanie Hensel and Nicole Craig to the Board for the balance of the 2018 to 2022 term;

   AND THAT the Thornbury Business Improvement Area Board requests the Chair to write to the Town of The Blue Mountains Council to advise of the nominations for Council’s consideration.

I am writing to respectfully request that council appoint Stephanie Hensel and Nicole Craig to the Thornbury BIA Board.

On behalf of the Board of Management

George Matamoros, Chair
Christine,

I have no doubt that the huge invoice relates to the irrigation I was obliged to use in order to protect my huge investment in landscaping. Without the water, that investment would have been wasted.

What I object to is the council approach to charging for utilities as it does. In effect council is penalizing those residents who are working to make Thornbury more beautiful and attractive to the general population and enhancing the overall reputation and image of the town.

Council imposes a fee to those who need to increase watering for their lands - this I approve.

Indeed we should be required to pay for the extra water that we use - that also is fair.

But what I can not condone is the following:

1) Equating the charges for sewer usage to the quantity of water consumed. On the first view, one could assume that the use of the sewage system might relate to the basic water usage but in most cases where water usage, the cause is pools and/or irrigation. Virtually none of the water ever finds it way into the town's sewage system. Why then are we charged exorbitant amounts for the system that we are not using and why are we charged increasing rates for the higher use of water. This seems to simply be a money grab by council.

By definition - Water is the amount of water coming into your house. Sewer is the portion of it that you use inside the house and that goes out through your drains, toilets, etc. There is a huge difference between these amounts once you consider irrigation.

2) Increasing the rate for water and sewage for higher consumption. Other areas (eg Toronto) charge a fixed rate per cubic meter over a very substantial volume (up to 5000 cubic meters) - if you exceed the set volume, the rates actually come DOWN, they do not increase. Set a reasonable fee for water that covers the councils requirements and then look at sewage based on average usage by households. In months of considerable increase of water usage, charge a reasonable rate for water - which could be higher than the current rate that would act as a deterrent to over consumption of water - leave sewage at the average consumption rate over the previous year, or base sewage on household requirements (based on the appliances that use water toilets, bathrooms, washing machines, dishwashers, etc)

I would appreciate if you will share this with Council for their consideration.

I also feel that the portion of our utilities invoice should be reconsidered with a credit of at least 50%.

David Craig
High Bluff Lane,
Thornbury, ON N0H2P0
Dear Honorable Friends

Re: CON [PT LOT] [RP] [PART]

We have been made aware of a deputation request by the property owners of two residential lots located at Concession 5 Part Lot [reference Plan] [Part], wherein they seek to present to the Honorable Council a reasonable basis for consideration of winter maintenance on at least an additional length, if not all of Concession 5 so as to render residential access viable during the winter months.

The purpose of this letter is to enthusiastically voice support for the applicant. As a property owner of the aforementioned, our property is located roughly west of the [property]. This acreage and one of equal size adjacent to it, owned by my sister, has been in our family for decades. As you are aware the property is for all intents and purposes without access for the duration of the winter in light of the current boundaries for snow removal. It is our respectful submission that without a great deal of compromise and adjustment to current boundaries the concerns currently upheld by the municipality can be served while yet providing us year round access.

The positon held by the applicant are of vital interest immediately while ours remains somewhat less acute. That notwithstanding we wish to advise the municipality that both my sister (who already has a building permit) and I desire to build year round permanent residences on the subject properties in the not too distant future which is why we wish to support the applicant and seek a solution that would mitigate for this long time difficulty.

As mentioned above we are aware of the concerns and considerations advanced by the municipality but wish to reinforce that it is our view a reasonable solution can be achieved if the invested parties merely undertake to review the circumstances with an eye towards conciliation and a reasonable outcome.

Yours truly,

Kevin Sly
C. Mr. S Carey
Director of Operations
Town of The Blue Mountains
September 18, 2020

To the Town of Blue Mountains
Committee of the Whole
Re: Delphi Lane and Delphi Beach Park Safety Concerns

Deputation submitted to Committee of the Whole:

Regarding: Safety concerns at Delphi Beach Park and Delphi Lane

To Whom it may concern,

We are owners of 2 vacant lots on Delphi Lane and previous owners of a residence on Delphi Lane (being full time residents for 2 years). We intent to be full time residents of this neighbourhood, in the next year and are on site daily.

Our intent is to state our concern for the impact of large numbers of non-residents and the safety of the neighbourhood/park.

Over the last 5 years, we have been both full time residents and owners of vacant land, with the intent to move back to this neighbourhood full time. We originally purchased multiple lots in this neighbourhood due to the quiet streets and safety of the area. Unfortunately, this is no longer the case.

We fully understand the need for heavy machinery, construction vehicles and higher volumes of traffic during work hours as private residences are being built.

Our concern comes from the new densely populated neighbourhood at the East end of Delphi Lane and the increasingly high numbers of visitors (who do not follow safety rules) at Delphi Beach park.

Our concerns include:

High speed of traffic on Delphi Lane – this is a danger with reduced visibility, both in part of high volumes of construction parking and in people trying to access the beach when the parking lot is full. We have two young children, as do many others on this street and the speeding from visitors trying to access the beach have increased greatly. We have witnessed street racing as well as large groups gathering and blocking the street. We have tried to contact OPP on this matter (including giving them licence plate numbers) and have had limited success.

Garbage and large gatherings at Delphi Beach/Park – Many times while we have tried to access the beach at the end of Delphi (where we are residents), we have witnessed garbage on the beach, in the forested areas and on the grass. We have also witnessed dumping of household garbage and large quantities being left by the picnic pavilion. This is not only a stress on the natural environment and the ANSI in this area, it creates problems with wildlife and a deterrent to using the natural environment that surrounds us. We have stopped going to the public area of the beach during the summer months as this has been a terribly negative experience in an area that was once protected, secluded and peaceful. The large groups that are utilizing the areas are not respecting the space with respect to bylaws or social
distancing recommendations. With all of this in combination, this area is in great need for proper rules and regulations in place and monitored by the town.

**Restrooms at Delphi Beach Park** – Due to the large numbers of people visiting the beach park, from both the parking lot and from the Village at Peaks Bay, the number of indecent acts that we have witnessed are disturbingly increasing. We have on multiple days, witnesses people defecating on both public and private property. The construction sites where multiple workers are present are required to have suitable washroom facilities, I would assume the same would be true at the park/beach. This is a non patrolled park, with many visitors and the facilities for restrooms are not meeting the needs. We have seen many people using the bushes and leaving behind human matter. This is disgusting! There are bylaws requiring animals to be cleaned up after, however the same is not being monitored for human visitors.

**Trespassing** – Due to the limited signage that divides the public areas from the private residences, there has been an increase in trespassing on public property. We have witnessed “picnics” on vacant lots, have video footage of people walking between the vacant lots to access highway 26 and have heard stories of many more circumstances. While living in our residence on Delphi Lane, we had 3-4 strangers weekly on our doorstep looking for information about the beach and park… this tells me that the marking of the neighbourhood and the park has no clear separation. By simply blocking off access at the west end of Delphi Lane, visitors are confused and then taking it upon themselves to go where they would like and how they like.

**Our proposed solutions would be:**

- To post signage for the neighbourhood “not a through street”, “residents of Peaks Bay Only”, “No beach parking”
- To post speed limit signs as well as “community safety zone”
- For Bylaw officers to monitor beach access, use and parking on streets
- For appropriate restroom facilities to be accessible by visitors
- To limit traffic on Delphi Lane, Deer Lane and Ellis Drive to “local residents only” as seen in other neighbourhoods in the area

Regards,

Ernest Herr

Julie Herr

William Claxton
March 2, 2019

Deputy Mayor Rob Potter & Members of Council
The Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

RE: Draft Municipal Licensing & Administrative Monetary Penalties By-laws

This is further to the short term accommodation meeting with industry members and the Blue Mountains Ratepayers Association held on February 18, 2020 and the release of Staff Report FAF.20.010 (considered by the Committee of the Whole on February 25, 2020).

Prior to commenting on Staff Report FAF.20.010, we would like to reiterate that The Blue Mountains Short Term Accommodation Owners Association (BMSTA) is not opposed to the continuation of a short term accommodation licensing regime that is fair, reasonable, non-discriminatory(1) and recognizes the significant contributions that the short term rental industry provides in terms of the vitality of the regional tourism industry and economy. Further, we would like to confirm our understanding of the following slides/comments presented/made by Town staff at the February 18, 2020 meeting:

- The “Noise Statistics” presented were respecting complaints received and not complaints that were validated by an attending officer. Further, that the corresponding occupant loads identified had not been confirmed but were reflective of what the licensed occupant load of a premise was. In summary, the only definitive Town staff statement related to the relationship between validated noise complaints and occupant load is that there is none (Fire Chief/Director of By-law Enforcement Rob Collins).

- The recommendation to move away from a licence renewal process to a process whereby applications will be assessed as “new” applications will entail ascertaining whether the use of the premises has changed, e.g. if a lawfully non-conforming use has continued without interruption since the issuance of a previous licence or, if the life safety amenities previously accepted by the Fire Department remain in place and continue to be operational. To be clear, the intention is not to re-visit or create new or additional requirements.

(1) It is BMSTA’s position that short term accommodation users should enjoy the use of roads (parking), walkways, parks and other public amenities as others and short term accommodation premises should be addressed the same as any other premise in the municipality as it relates to long-grass, noise, property standards, use of hot tubs, fire pits, etc.
• The Town agreed to respond to the numerous questions/comments previously posed by the Association, in particular our communications of May 5, 2019 and December 12, 2019.

With respect to Staff Report FAF.20.010 and the Draft By-laws, BMSTA notes that significant strides have been made in terms of the structure and clarity of the Draft Municipal Licensing By-law and that some of our previously identified concerns have been addressed however, new and additional regulations are proposed to be introduced, creating new concerns.

As to the Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law, BMSTA submits that some of the proposed penalties are extremely punitive and therefore contrary to the provisions of the Municipal Act. Further, BMSTA submits that the penalties associated with Noise, Property Standards and Waste Collection By-laws are discriminatory and should not be applied exclusively to short term rental accommodation premises but to all premises in the Town (noise is noise, deficient properties are deficient properties, waste is waste).

Our detailed comments respecting the Report and Draft By-laws are attached. It is hoped that the foregoing and attached comments will provide a basis for further dialogue and ultimate concurrence in terms of a fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory approach to short term accommodation licensing and the establishment of the Town’s first Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law.

Respectfully,

The Blue Mountains Short Term Accommodation Owners’ Association
Staff Report FAF.20.010

1. The Report recommends that the Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law be brought forward for enactment on April 6, 2020, we believe that this is premature as some of the provisions referenced are yet to be enacted by by-law, further dialogue must be had and Council should be presented with options to address concerns respecting the discriminatory nature of the by-law to make a clear (see comments under the heading Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law).

2. The Report at page 2 indicates that representations and correspondence from the public “provided Council and staff with a range of perspectives and information that have been outlined in the Analysis Section of this report”. Respectfully, BMSTA continues to wait for responses to questions/comments raised in our previous communications, as well as at Public Meetings, with the majority of the issues raised not addressed in the Analysis Section of the Report, nor at any other time.

3. The Report identifies, and BMSTA agrees, that the draft Municipal Licensing By-law has undergone significant changes from the previous versions presented and that a further Public Meeting should be held along with further discussion between Town staff and the industry (also see our comments in terms of the status of necessary revisions to the Property Standards By-law that were previously identified by Town staff).

4. The Report acknowledges that the Town has utilized a 2 + 4 Model since the establishment of POL.STAL.14.02. This is consistent with what BMSTA has advised the Town and others for the past 24 months and it is appreciated that this matter can now be closed.

5. With respect to the updating of the Town’s Property Standards By-law, which was Town staff’s reasoning to recommend that the previous Council defer the enactment of a by-law in November 2018, please advise as to the status of same and the need for this to be completed prior to the finalization of a Municipal Licensing By-law.

6. With respect to the levying of demerit points when the Director of Legal Services deems repeated warnings to be a “nuisance”, BMSTA notes that this is extremely vague and uncertain, is likely void, and would likely be struck down by the courts if challenged. Further, with respect to nuisance, BMSTA requests that Council considering enacting a By-law to address nuisance and/or frivolous complaints to
hold persons accountable for their actions and the related costs to injured parties and the Town taxpayer.

7. Respecting the assignment of demerit points, BMSTA is opposed to same where the responsible person has not had the opportunity to address a complaint, be it a valid or frivolous complaint, and the responsible person has had the opportunity to speak to an individual that may be contravening a Renter’s Code and/or Town By-law. BMSTA supports the current enforcement methodology wherein a responsible person is provided an opportunity to address a complaint prior to the Town's consideration of the assignment of demerit points.

8. The recommendation at page 5 to re-visit the “Legal Non-Conforming status” previously accepted by the Town is contrary to what BMSTA was advised of on February 18, 2020 meeting and is extremely concerning. This should not only be concerning from an owner’s perspective, but it also should be concerning to the Town from a municipal liability perspective. As noted previously, this matter was clarified at the meeting held on February 18, 2020 and confirmation of our understanding is requested.

9. The matter of whether a use, building or structure is protected pursuant to Section 34(9) of the Planning Act is complex. Respectfully, it is so complex that it is submitted that a Registered Planner and the Town’s Director of Planning and Development Services are not necessarily qualified to render a decision on whether a use enjoys protection, be it from a parking, occupant load or other perspective. A number of site specific issues have arisen previously wherein advice by Town legal counsel would have saved the proponent and the Town time and money.

10. The application fee structure presented at the February 18, 2020 meeting was not supported by an analysis and thus the Town has not established the necessary nexus between the service provided and the proposed fee. BMSTA respectfully requests that this analysis be provided.

   It is noted that the Report is clear that the review of subsequent applications will become more efficient, and thus presumably less costly to the municipality, and it therefore begs the question of whether there is in fact a nexus between the fee and service, especially as it relates to renewals.

11. While noise monitoring may be warranted in the non-exception areas, BMSTA questions the need within the exception areas. This reasoning is supported by the evidence presented at the Ontario Municipal Board and is evident in the regulations found within the approved Zoning By-law(s).
12. With regard to outdoor hot tubs, pools and fire pits, BMSTA notes that the noise related concerns associated with these should be addressed by way of the Town’s Noise By-law. As an alternative, BMSTA submits that should the Town decide to proceed with regulating the use of these amenities that the Town should do so for all uses across the municipality. BMSTA submits that the use of outdoor hot tubs after 11:00 p.m. on adjacent short term accommodation premises is less problematic than the use of same on adjacent conventional residential premises.

13. The Report at the bottom of page 8 indicates that the Town has not received comments respecting the draft Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law. In this regard, BMSTA notes that it has made numerous verbal and written comments on the punitive nature of the proposed penalties, the discriminatory nature of the penalties in only applying to short term accommodation uses and the lack of jurisdiction to proceed with penalties under Provincial legislation.

14. BMSTA has continually raised the need for the Draft By-laws to be reviewed by the Town’s legal counsel, we continue to raise this as being necessary especially given the discriminatory authority proposed to be provided to the Director of Legal Services; the proposed role for planners with respect to complex legal matters (i.e. lawfully non-conforming); and, the punitive and discriminatory nature of the proposed Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law.

Draft Municipal Licensing By-law

15. “Exception Area” definition – Should the word “not” in the following be removed - “where Short Term Rental Units are not considered a permitted use”? Also, Short Term Rental Units are not a defined or classified term in the zoning by-law.

16. “Parking Management Plan” definition – BMSTA submits that the requirement for a professional to prepare a Parking Management Plan is extreme, especially when the Town can achieve the same level of completeness and/or accuracy by demanding that these plans be drawn to scale and be fully dimensioned.

It is noted that the persons identified in the definition are regulated by professional associations established pursuant to Provincial legislation with such legislation precluding a person from practicing in that profession. Given this, it is submitted that the “equivalent” can only be someone who is similarly regulated.

Parking Management Plans can be prepared by technologists and designers that are not regulated by a profession. Drawings to scale that are fully dimensioned in support of a building permit application for a dwelling house, addition to a dwelling house or an accessory building can be prepared by a homeowner.
Lastly, BMSTA is not sure why this requirement appears in the By-law versus a submission checklist.

17. "Zoning By-law" definition – Should Section 38 of the Planning Act be referenced?

18. Section 11.5 – Demerit Point System - Discretionary authority to determine a nuisance? A nuisance is an offence under the Criminal Code. It would appear that the Town is assigning to the Director the arbitrary authority to assign demerit points to a criminal undertaking. See previous comments at item 6 above.

19. Section 12.0 – Fees – When is the Public Hearing to amend the Fees and Charges By-law envisioned to take place?

20. Schedule “B” – Item 1 – Re “nuisance”, see previous comments at item 6 above.

21. Schedule “B” – Item 9 – Re “nuisance”, see previous comments at item 6 above.

22. Schedule “B” – Item 12 – Re “noise notification system”, see previous comments at item 11 above.

23. Schedule “B” – Items 17 & 18 – Re “hot tub” and “fire pit”, see previous comments at item 12 above.

24. Schedule “C” – Should this Map be entitled “Exception Area Maps”?

25. Schedule “D” and “E” – Section 2.5 – Please clarify what the intent of this Section is. It would appear that this Section may take precedence over any protection under Section 34(9) of the Planning Act as it relates to parking. Also, see our comments at items 8 and 9 above.

26. Schedule “D” – Section 2.7 j) – See previous comments at item 11 above.

27. Schedule “D”, “E” and “F” – Section 2.8 – How can the Responsible Person be held responsible for the “conduct of the Renter and the occupants of the Premises”? BMSTA members continue to educate and inform renters, require renters to adhere to stringent rules, require the posting of security deposits, provide neighbourhood patrol services and employ a responsible person to respond to complaints within the legislated time but should not and cannot be held responsible for the behavioral issues of the renter and occupants of a premise.

28. Schedule “D”, “E” and “F” – Section 2.10 – Re “hot tub and pool”, see previous comments at item 12 above.
29. Schedule “G” – No comments

Administrative Monetary Penalties By-law

1. See BMSTA’s previous comments respecting the punitive nature of the penalties and non-compliance with the provisions of the Municipal Act and the discriminatory nature of the by-law.

2. The recommendation contained in the Staff Report recommends that Council consider the enactment of the by-law in advance of Council’s enactment of the Municipal Licensing By-law (recommended date of April 6, 2020). BMSTA believes this is premature and recommends that an amended by-law be brought forward concurrent with the Municipal Licensing By-law.
September 21, 2020

Mayor Soever & Members of Council
The Town of The Blue Mountains
32 Mill Street
Thornbury, ON N0H 2P0

RE: Staff Report FAF.20.152 - Licensing & Short Term Accommodation and Administrative Monetary Penalties By-laws

We have recently been provided with a copy of Staff Report FAF.20.152 and the Draft Licensing & Short Term Accommodation and Administrative Monetary Penalties By-laws. This Staff Report, Draft By-laws and related recommendation to bring both By-laws forward for enactment, with a further staff report, at the November 16, 2020 meeting of Council came as a surprise to BMSTA given that Council on March 9, 2020, following multiple discussions and meetings with stakeholders and an acknowledgment that further consultative work was to be done, adopted the following recommendation:

"AND THAT Council accept the Municipal Licensing By-law as presented in this report and direct staff to initiate a second public meeting to be scheduled for the April 6, 2020 meeting of Council"

Given the Pandemic, the second public meeting schedule for April 6, 2020 did not occur.

As Council is aware, and as evidenced by BMSTA’s correspondence of March 2, 2020, copy attached, BMSTA had concerns with the content of Staff Report FAF.20.010, the associated presentations and data and the draft by-laws. These concerns, and those of other stakeholders, were enough for Council to determine that a further public meeting was necessary. BMSTA believed that a second public meeting, and the related dialogue that would occur leading up to it, would provide for a process that would potentially lead to a better understanding of the issues, articulated by-laws and perhaps consensus amongst the stakeholders in terms of the rules, regulations and processes.

In addition, we note that at the time that Staff Report FAF.20.010 was considered that only 5 members of Council had the benefit of the approximate 1 hour presentation and discussion; and, there were outstanding matters associated with the draft by-law and proposed procedures that required further dialogue and clarification prior to Council’s consideration of the enactment of the by-laws. The matters that required further clarification and possible incorporation into the by-laws included:
• no demerit points were to be assigned if an operator did not have opportunity to resolve an issue;
• reduction of an operator’s response time from 1 hour to 30 minutes and the corresponding notification procedures associated with this reduction;
• clarification in terms of Town staff’s procedures and application of the by-law especially in terms of reducing occupant loads by way of the application of the by-law by means of applying “new” parking standards when uses are protected by Section 34(9) of the Planning Act;
• the subjective nature of the ability for the License issuer to impose additional terms and conditions;
• the lack of consistency/discrimination in terms of the application of AMPs to licensed premises versus all premises, including dwelling houses, within the municipality (waste/garbage is waste/garbage, long grass is long grass, a property standards violation is a property standards violation);
• confirmation that Town staff will not require “stamped” drawings, i.e. drawings prepared by a licensed architect or engineer, in support of a licence application; and, the utilization of systems such as Noise Aware and how these systems would be recognized and incorporated into the licensing program.

Now after 6.5 months, and further changes to the draft by-laws, Town staff are recommending that Council consider moving forward with enacting the draft by-laws on November 16, 2020. This recommendation leaves BMSTA, and we are sure other stakeholders, wondering about procedural fairness, openness, transparency and interest in objectively listening to the community.

The world has changed since the Pandemic and Council’s last consideration of this matter on March 9, 2020. In evaluating the necessity for a further public meeting, and in addition to the matters previously raised, BMSTA requests that Council consider that the Pandemic may have impacted the interests of residents, community guests/visitors and STA owners and operators. Further, BMSTA requests that Council consider that in the past 6.5 months the stakeholder group has changed, specifically the ownership and management of potentially affected properties, and how these persons will be heard prior to Council making a final determination of the draft by-laws.

Lastly, and not to diminish the issues noted above, we request clarification as to the process for Council’s reconsideration of a matter vis a vie not to proceed with a further public meeting.

Respectfully,

BMSTA

The Blue Mountains Short Term Accommodation Owners’ Association
Enbridge Gas Inc. has applied to dispose of certain account balances and for approval of the amount of its earnings that it must share with customers.

Learn more. Have your say.

Enbridge Gas Inc. has applied to the Ontario Energy Board for approval to dispose of amounts recorded in certain deferral and variance accounts and for approval of the amount of its 2019 earnings that it is required to share with customers.

If the application is approved as filed, a typical residential customer in the EGD Rate Zone (former Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. customers) would pay a one-time charge of $0.74 in January 2021.

A typical residential customer in each of the Union Rate Zones (former Union Gas Limited customers) would see the following impacts:

- Union South Rate Zone: a total charge of $4.97 collected over three months, from January to March 2021
- Union North West Rate Zone: a total credit of $61.53 received over three months, from January to March 2021
- Union North East Rate Zone: a total credit of $5.94 received over three months, from January to March 2021

Other customers, including businesses, may also be affected.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD WILL HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING

The Ontario Energy Board (OEB) will hold a public hearing to consider the application filed by Enbridge Gas. During this hearing, which could be an oral or written hearing, we will question Enbridge Gas on the case. We will also hear questions and arguments from individuals that have registered to participate (called intervenors) in the OEB's hearing. At the end of this hearing, the OEB will decide whether the amounts and the charges or credits requested in the application will be approved.

The OEB is an independent and impartial public agency. We make decisions that serve the public interest. Our goal is to promote a financially viable and efficient energy sector that provides you with reliable energy services at a reasonable cost.

BE INFORMED AND HAVE YOUR SAY

You have the right to information regarding this application and to be involved in the process.

- You can review Enbridge Gas’ application on the OEB’s website now
- You can file a letter with your comments, which will be considered during the hearing
- You can become an intervenor. As an intervenor you can ask questions about Enbridge Gas’ application and make arguments on whether the OEB should approve Enbridge Gas’ request. Apply by October 8, 2020 or the hearing will go ahead without you and you will not receive any further notice of the proceeding
- At the end of the process, you can review the OEB’s decision and its reasons on our website

The OEB intends to consider cost awards in this proceeding that are in accordance with the Practice Direction on Cost Awards and only in relation to the following:

1) The review of the following deferral and variance accounts:

   - EGD Rate Zone (former Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.) Accounts
     - Storage and Transportation Deferral Account
     - Transactional Services Deferral Account
     - Unaccounted for Gas Variance Account
     - Average Use True-Up Variance Account
     - Deferred Rebate Account
     - Dawn Access Costs Deferral Account
     - Gas Supply Plan Cost Consequences Deferral Account

   - Union Rate Zones (former Union Gas Limited) Accounts
     - Unabsorbed Demand Costs Variance Account
     - Upstream Transportation Optimization Deferral Account
     - Short-Term Storage and Other Balancing Services Deferral Account
     - Normalized Average Consumption Deferral Account
     - Unaccounted for Gas Volume Variance Account
     - Unaccounted for Gas Price Variance Account
     - Parkway West Project Costs Deferral Account
     - Brantford-Kirkwall / Parkway D Project Costs Deferral Account
     - Parkway Obligation Rate Variance Deferral Account
     - Lobo C Compressor / Hamilton-Milton Pipeline Project Costs Deferral Account
     - Lobo D / Bright C / Dawn H Compressor Project Costs Deferral Account
     - Burlington-Oakville Project Costs Deferral Account
     - Sudbury Replacement Project Variance Account


Panhandle Reinforcement Project Costs Deferral Account
Pension and Other Post-Employment Benefits Variance Account
Deferral Clearing Variance Account

Enbridge Gas Inc. Accounts
Account Policy Changes Deferral Account
Earning Sharing Deferral Account
Tax Variance Deferral Account

2) The review of Enbridge Gas Inc.'s 2019 utility results and earnings sharing amounts.

3) The review of the methodology for disposing and allocating the deferral and variance account balances and the 2019 earnings sharing amount, if any.

LEARN MORE
Our file number for this case is EB-2020-0134. To learn more about this hearing, find instructions on how to file a letter with your comments or become an intervenor, or to access any document related to this case, please enter the file number EB-2020-0134 on the OEB website: www.oeb.ca/participate. You can also phone our Consumer Relations Centre at 1-877-632-2727 with any questions.

ORAL VS. WRITTEN HEARINGS
There are two types of OEB hearings – oral and written. Enbridge Gas has applied for a written hearing. The OEB is considering this request. If you think an oral hearing is needed, you can write to the OEB to explain why by October 8, 2020.

PRIVACY
If you write a letter of comment, your name and the content of your letter will be put on the public record and the OEB website. However, your personal telephone number, home address and e-mail address will be removed. If you are a business, all your information will remain public. If you apply to become an intervenor, all information will be public.

This rate hearing will be held under section 36 of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15, Schedule B.
September 18, 2020

Dear Town Council and Staff,

It is my pleasure, on behalf of the Board, staff and volunteers at BVO, to send along our sincere thanks to the Town for the help we have received this summer.

Without the exclusive use of the Community Centre, we would not have been able to run our Summer Camp. Local working parents were very grateful for this program.

Access to space at the Landfill site meant that we were able to augment our funding with income from our Bottles for BVO initiative.

The success of Lobsterfest gave us a much needed donation of funds, given that we have been without our regular income from the Treasure Shop for an extended period.

It is impossible to overstate the importance BVO attaches to our partnership with the Town and the support of Council, especially in these difficult times. Please accept our heartfelt thanks for all of your assistance.

Sincerely,

Cathy Innes, Chair
BVO Board of Directors