

VIA E-MAIL

November 15, 2019

Ontario Energy Board
Attn: Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary
P.O. Box 2319
27th Floor, 2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

RE: EB-2019-0172– EGI Windsor Line Replacement – FRPO Response

We are writing on behalf of the Federation of Rental-housing Providers of Ontario (“FRPO”) in response to the Procedural Order No. 2 in EB-2019-0172. We thank the Board for their consideration of our concerns and request for further discovery.

We organize our submissions in response to those provided to the Board.

Response to EGI Submissions

In its submissions, EGI:

- 1) *Proposes “like-for-like sizing”*. That continuity of design might make sense if matters have not evolved over time. However, in the applicant’s proposal the Applicant is not recommending 10” replacement as circumstances have evolved over the decades since original installation which would indicate an appropriate analysis of facilities to meet the needs of now and the foreseeable future is required.
- 2) *Asserts the design is not to meet current but future needs*. The company has provided no evidentiary basis for future needs particularly delineated between east and west of Comber.
- 3) *Asserts downsizing will create a bottleneck*. A bottleneck implies a constraint of flow from where gas is to where it is needed which from a review of the evidence to this point cannot be established.
- 4) *Asserts inefficiency through designing for redundancy*. With all due respect, appropriate economic design principles can provide resiliency in a system. But spending incremental millions on the un-forecasted potential utilization is not prudent.
- 5) *Asserts “A further discovery isn’t necessary as the impact of any NPS 4 is clear in that it is inadequate in meeting the needs for this Project”*.¹ This submission lacks authenticity when in response to our inquiry about meeting the forecasted needs of the project, the Applicant conceded that only 40% of NPS 4 would have to be increased to NPS 6.²

¹ EGI_ReplySUB_WindsorLTC_20191114

² Exhibit I.FRPO.15

Respectfully submitted, given the lack of evidence and the above responses, there has been no clarity regarding the appropriate design sizing.

Response to Additional Submissions

Energy Probe expressed concerns regarding the basis for replacement as integrity matters without sufficient evidentiary support. While we have not focused on that aspect, we respectfully submit that, if the Board would allow additional discovery, Energy Probe would have opportunity to pursue its concerns beyond the limited opportunity to this point.

Board Staff submitted that a timely exploration of the hybrid option is within the project timeline. Further, we commend Staff for noting that EGI response on the asserted infeasibility was at 1380 kPa and not the proposed 3450 kPa. The Applicant did not respond to the inquiry about NPS 4 feasibility east of Comber at the proposed MOP of 3450 kPa but the presumptive and limiting pressure of 1380kPa.

Conclusion

As described in our submission of November 9, 2019, the Windsor Line's purpose has evolved over the decades. In meeting the market needs of today, it receives gas at Comber and distributes it east and west³. As such, the pipeline meets the needs of two distinct markets. In our view, the Applicant has not distinguished that segmentation. Further, in support of its objectives, has tried to limit discovery that is in the public interest.

We respectfully submit that a Technical Conference is in the public interest as we had requested in our Intervention Request of October 8th.

³ Exhibit I.FRPO.6 Attachment 1

Scheduling

Board Staff noted that a Technical Conference noted that a timely exploration through Technical Conference is tenable. We agree and respectfully submit that with the ongoing EGI settlement conference for 2018 deferral accounts on-going this week and a condensed scheduling of the EGI 2020 rates proceeding next week (and I am unavailable on No. 28th and 29th) that a technical conference, facilitated by questions advanced to the company in the month of December would provide an effective process for these issues to be investigated appropriately with the potential to allow sufficient discovery to allow for a written hearing.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of FRPO,



Dwayne R. Quinn
Principal
DR QUINN & ASSOCIATES LTD.

- c. R. Torul, EGI Regulatory Proceedings – EGI
J. Fernandes – Board Staff
Interested Parties