

**CREEKFORD ROAD REINFORCEMENT PROJECT
EB-2009-0061**

Board Staff Interrogatories

1) Projected Load Increases

Reference

Pre-filed Evidence Schedule 3

Preamble

In Schedule 3, a construction/gas connection forecast is provided for the service area in question and as a consequence of this forecast, Union states there will be a requirement for more than 400 new connections (mostly residential single and multi-family dwellings) between 2009 and the end of 2018.

Questions

- a) On a year over year basis, what does Union project the load increase to be in percentage terms on both a peak demand and volumetric usage basis between 2009 and 2018?
- b) Given that Union utilizes this particular planning protocol on a regular basis to project future gas usage and demand requirements, how accurate has this protocol proven to be in the past and if inaccuracies have occurred how has Union taken these inaccuracies into consideration in its current planning process (e.g. has the current economic downturn been factored into the process)?

2) Pipeline Preferred Route

Reference

Pre-filed Evidence Paragraph 45

Preamble

In paragraph 45, Union states that it has discussed the road allowance portion of the project with personnel from the City of Kingston and received preliminary approval from the City of Kingston regarding the proposed pipeline installation.

Question

- a) What other agencies/parties have provided preliminary approval with respect to this project? Is Union expecting approval from any additional parties that it has not yet heard from? What agencies/parties (if any) have indicated to Union that they are not in agreement with respect to this project?

3) Environmental Review Report

Reference

Pre-filed Evidence Paragraph 56

Preamble

In Paragraph 56, Union stated that that it would provide a summary of the comments received regarding the Environmental Review Report as well as Union's response to these comments.

Question/Request

- a) Please provide a copy of all comments received to date regarding the Environmental Review Report for the project as well as a copy of Union's response to these comments.

4) Comparison of Alternatives

Reference

Pre-filed Evidence Schedule 8, pages 8-11

Preamble

In Schedule 8, Section 3.5 Union compares various alternatives as follows:

- The P.I. of this reinforcement was less favourable than the other alternatives (3.5.1 – Joining Two Independent Systems)
- This Reinforcement alternative was rejected due to the fact that the routing of the pipeline was not preferred (3.5.3 – Reinforcement from an Alternate Route)
- This alternative provides additional system integrity benefits (3.5.4– Reinforcement with a Second Feed)

Questions

- a) What was the P.I. for Alternative 3.5.1?
- b) Please explain why the routing for alternative for Alternative 3.5.3 was considered undesirable?
- c) What were the additional system integrity benefits anticipated for Alternative 3.5.4?

5. MTO Concerns

Reference

Letter to Union (copied to the Board) from the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario dated April 8, 2008

Preamble

In its letter of April 8 2008, the MTO expressed concerns regarding the proposed routing of the pipeline for the proposed project in the vicinity of the Creekford Road/Gardiners Road intersection.

Question

- a) When does Union anticipate sending drawings and engineering documentation regarding its proposals for the Creekford Road/Gardiners Road intersection to the MTO (both the Ottawa and Kingston MTO Offices)?

6. Collins Creek Crossing

Reference

Azimuth Environmental Review Report Page 27 and 28

Preamble

In the Environmental Review Report, Azimuth makes reference to hydrostatic testing at the completion of the project.

Question/Request

- a) Please confirm that if there is a requirement to bring water to the site for hydrostatic testing (inadequate flow from Collins Creek), that the water will be of similar or higher quality than that in the receiving watercourse and if chlorinated water is used for testing then the

chlorine be allowed to dissipate before it is released into the receiving watercourse as noted on page 28 of the Azimuth Environmental Review Report.

7. Potential Contamination along Proposed Route

Reference

Environmental Review Report Page 28

Preamble

In the Environmental Review Report, Azimuth makes reference to possible soil contamination along the proposed route near Gardiners Road

Question/Request

- a) Please detail the soil and groundwater management program that will be used by Union if there is contaminated soil found near the auto wreacking yard that is located on Creekford Road near Gardiners Road

8. Consultations with Aboriginal Peoples:

Please provide a status update with regard to the following;

- a) Identify all of the Aboriginal groups that have been contacted in respect of this application.
- b) Indicate:
 - i) how the Aboriginal groups were identified;
 - ii) when contact was first initiated;
 - iii) the individuals within the Aboriginal group who were contacted, and their position in or representative role for the group;
 - iv) a listing, including the dates, of any phone calls, meetings and other means that may have been used to provide information about the project and hear any interests or concerns of Aboriginal groups with respect to the project.

- c) Provide relevant information gathered from or about the Aboriginal groups as to their treaty rights, any filed and outstanding claims or litigation concerning their treaty rights, treaty land entitlement or aboriginal title or rights, which may potentially be impacted by the project.
- d) Provide any relevant written documentation regarding consultations, such as notes or minutes that may have been taken at meetings or from phone calls, or letters received from, or sent to, Aboriginal groups.
- e) Identify any specific issues or concerns that have been raised by Aboriginal groups in respect of the project and, where applicable, how those issues or concerns will be mitigated or accommodated.
- f) Explain whether any of the concerns raised by Aboriginal groups with respect to the applied-for project have been discussed with any government department or agencies, and if so, identify when contacts were made and who was contacted.
- g) If any of the Aboriginal groups who were contacted either support the application or have no objection to the project proceeding, identify those groups and provide any available written documentation of their position. Also, indicate if their positions are final or preliminary or conditional in nature.
- h) Provide details of any know Crown involvement in consultations with Aboriginal groups in respect of the applied-for project.