



Bonnie Jean Adams
Regulatory Coordinator
Regulatory Affairs

tel 416-495-5499
fax 416-495-6072
EGDRegulatoryProceedings@enbridge.com

Enbridge Gas Distribution
500 Consumers Road
North York, Ontario M2J 1P8
Canada

August 5, 2015

VIA RESS, EMAIL and COURIER

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli,

**Re: Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. (the “Company” or “Enbridge”)
Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) File: EB-2015-0049
Multi-Year Demand Side Management Plan (2015 to 2020)
Interrogatories on GEC Evidence**

Enclosed, please find the interrogatories of Enbridge on the evidence prepared by Mr. Neme (Energy Futures Group) and filed by GEC in the above noted proceeding.

The submission has been filed through the Board’s Regulatory Electronic Submission System (“RESS”) and will be available on the Company’s website under the “Other Regulatory Proceedings” tab at www.enbridgegas.com/ratecase.

If you require further information, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

(Original Signed)

Bonnie Jean Adams
Regulatory Coordinator

cc: Mr. Dennis O’Leary, Aird &Berlis
EB-2015-0049 Intervenors

ENBRIDGE GAS DISTRIBUTION INC.
INTERROGATORIES FOR GREEN ENERGY COALITION

1. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 7
EB-2015-0049, Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 2, Page 25 of 26

Preamble:

Page 7 of GEC's report states that "The current Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) and Audit Committee (AC) processes work fairly well and should be retained with some important modifications....However, several refinements to those processes would be welcome:

- a. Adding Board staff to all of the committees.
- b. Removing the last vestiges of control of the Custom Project Savings Verification (CPSV) processes from the utilities; ideally the Auditor should now hire and manage the CPSV work.
- c. Establishing a streamlined process for addressing the few situations in which consensus is not reached in the TEC."

Request:

- a) Please confirm that page 18 of Section 7.1.3 in the Board's Guidelines already addresses having the auditor hire the CPSV firm.

"...the Board will be responsible for selecting an auditor to assess the results of the natural gas utilities' DSM programs. The Board will strive to have an auditor hired by October 1st for the year to be audited¹. This would enable the auditor to hire engineering firm(s) who will conduct verification studies, including custom project savings verifications ("CPSV") and the evaluation of other programs..."

- b) Please further confirm that the Audit Committee were involved in reviewing the bids, selecting the CPSV firm and involved in subsequent discussions with the CPSV firm.

¹ This process will begin in 2015 and be applicable to the 2015 DSM program year results.

2. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 10

Request:

Of statewide natural gas DSM budgets within each jurisdiction presented in Figure 1, please identify the portion of natural gas DSM budgets which are dedicated to programs which do not seek to achieve direct or measureable natural gas savings (i.e. non-Resource Acquisition programs).

3. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 10

Request:

For each jurisdiction in Figure 1, please provide any goals, objectives, principles or priorities of natural gas DSM which may be considered equivalent to the guiding principles and key priorities outlined by the Board in its DSM Framework.

4. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 18

Request:

- a) Please provide a version of Table 3 on page 18 which includes a column for first year benefits only (as opposed to net present value of benefits).
- b) Please also provide a column with first year costs.

5. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 19

“...the combined effects on rates of *both* DSM budgets *and* the system-wide benefits they produce...would be on the order of \$1 per month *reduction* over the life of the efficiency measures installed.”

Request:

Please provide a detailed description of the inputs and formulae used to establish the above noted value in excel format.

6. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 32

“...many customers have measures with very short paybacks that they do not pursue without DSM program support.”

Request:

- a) Please confirm that there are factors beyond payback, and perhaps in spite of short paybacks, that a customer considers when deciding whether or not to pursue a DSM project.
- b) Please elaborate on what other barriers there might be to uptake of energy savings activities without DSM assistance.

7. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 41

Preamble:

Mr. Neme references two reports that he co-authored; one with Mr. Grevatt (2015), and another with Mr. Sedano (2012).

Request:

Please provide the cited reports.

8. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 44 and 47

Preamble:

“...ensure that at least one case study is launched as a pilot project in the field before the end of 2016 to enhance its transition plan.”

Request:

Please confirm that it is prudent in natural gas infrastructure projects to fully consider and evaluate untested (in natural gas) theoretical concepts in advance of practical implementation to ensure the method is effective and the funds are appropriately spent.

9. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 42

Preamble:

“What is the cost of the infrastructure project? It does not make sense to invest in detailed assessments of alternatives to very inexpensive infrastructure projects. Thus, most jurisdictions now required consideration of DSM as a potential alternative if the infrastructure project costs at least \$1 million.”

Request:

- (a) Please indicate whether this statement is in reference to the electric industry or natural gas industry.
- (b) Please create a chart indicating the jurisdiction with IRP, whether it is gas or electric and the relevant threshold for considering DSM as a potential alternative.
10. Reference: Exhibit L.GEC.1, page 47

Preamble

“Instruct both utilities to work with interested stakeholders on their studies and the development of pilot projects.”

Request:

Please confirm that Enbridge identified in EB-2014-0049, I.T12.EGDI.EP.32 b), that it would include stakeholders in the consultation of the IRP study and thus had already addressed Mr. Neme’s recommendation. To be helpful, the excerpt from that particular interrogatory response reads as follows:

“Enbridge anticipates that an IRP study would benefit from intervenor involvement with respect to reviewing and commenting on draft reports and other documents at key stages of the study. This approach will ensure that intervenors representing Ontario ratepayers and other interest groups will have the opportunity to bring their perspectives to the study team.”