



THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair, GAIL REGAN
President, Cara Holdings Ltd

President, PATRICIA ADAMS

MAX ALLEN

Producer, IDEAS, CBC Radio

ANDREW COYNE

Columnist, National Post

GLENN FOX

Professor of Economics, University of Guelph

IAN GRAY

President, St. Lawrence Starch Co.

CLIFFORD ORWIN

Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto

Secretary Treasurer, ANNETTA TURNER

ANDREW ROMAN

Barrister & Solicitor, Miller Thomson

ANDREW STARK

Rotman School of Management, University of Toronto

GEORGE TOMKO

Resident Expert, PSI Initiative, University of Toronto

MICHAEL TREBILCOCK

Chair, Law & Economics, University of Toronto

MARGARET WENTE

Columnist, The Globe and Mail

May 21, 2013

BY EMAIL & COURIER

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge St, Suite 2701
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Board File No. EB-2012-0451/EB-2012-0433/EB-2013-0074
Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. & Union Gas Limited
Leave to Construct Natural Gas Pipelines and Regulation Facilities Expansion
Energy Probe – Interrogatories

Pursuant to Procedural Order No. 2, issued May 8, 2013, please find attached the Interrogatories of Energy Probe Research Foundation (Energy Probe) to Enbridge Gas Distribution and Union Gas Limited in the combined proceeding.

Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

David S. MacIntosh
Case Manager

cc: Norm Rykman, Enbridge Gas Distribution (By email)
Fred Cass, Aird & Berlis LLP (By email)
Scott Stoll, Aird & Berlis LLP (By email)
Mark Kitchen, Union Gas (By email)
Crawford Smith, Torys LLP (By email)
Roger Higgin, Consultant to Energy Probe (By email)
Shelley Grice, Consultant to Energy Probe (By email)
Parties of Interest (By email)

Energy Probe Research Foundation 225 BRUNSWICK AVE., TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 2M6

Phone: (416) 964-9223 Fax: (416) 964-8239 E-mail: EnergyProbe@nextcity.com Internet: www.EnergyProbe.org

EB-2012-0451
EB-2012-0433
EB-2013-0074

IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. for: an order or orders granting leave to construct a natural gas pipeline and ancillary facilities in the Town of Milton, City of Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, City of Brampton, City of Toronto, City of Vaughan and the Region of Halton, the Region of Peel and the Region of York; and an order or orders approving the methodology to establish a rate for transportation services for TransCanada Pipelines Limited;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Union Gas Limited for: an Order or Orders for pre-approval of recovery of the cost consequences of all facilities associated with the development of the proposed Parkway West site; an Order or Orders granting leave to construct natural gas pipelines and ancillary facilities in the Town of Milton; an Order or Orders for pre-approval of recovery of the cost consequences of all facilities associated with the development of the proposed Brantford-Kirkwall/Parkway D Compressor Station project; an Order or Orders for pre-approval of the cost consequences of two long term short haul transportation contracts; and an Order or Orders granting leave to construct natural gas pipelines and ancillary facilities in the City of Cambridge and City of Hamilton.

**INTERROGATORIES OF
ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION
("ENERGY PROBE")**

May 21, 2013

EB-2012-0451
EB-2012-0433
EB-2013-0074

Enbridge Gas Distribution and Union Gas Limited

**ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION
INTERROGATORIES**

Issue A1 Are the proposed facilities needed? Considerations may include but are not limited to demand, reliability, security of supply, flexibility, constraints, operational risk, cost savings and diversity as well as the Board's statutory objectives.

A1-Energy Probe 1

Ref: EB-2012-0433 and EB-2013-0074 Parts 1-5; Section 1 Page 6 para. 11 (list of the facilities)

Preamble: Clarification of ownership and costs of land and site development and the proposed allocation of these site costs to the three projects for Economic Evaluation purposes:

- a) Please confirm the following:
- LCU located on Part 2
 - Parkway D Compressor also located on Part 2
 - Enbridge Gate station/Measurement on Part 1
- b) Please provide a table with PW land and site development costs and how these are allocated to the economic evaluation of the 3 projects.

Cost Item	Ownership	Cost	Allocation for Economic Evaluation				TOTAL
			LCU	EGD	Parkway D	Other	
Land							
Land Part 2							
Land Part 3							
Land Part 4							
Land Part 5							
Subtotal							
Site Develop							
Part 1							
Part 2							
Part 3							
Part 4							
Part 5							
Subtotal							

c) Please reconcile to prefiled evidence.

Issue A2 Do the proposed facilities meet the Board's economic tests as outlined in the Filing Guidelines on the Economic Tests for Transmission Pipeline Applications, dated February 21, 2013 and E.B.O. 188 as applicable?

A2-Energy Probe 2

Ref: Union EB-2012-0433 No reference

Please confirm that Union's position is that for LCU Economic Evaluation under EBO 134 or E.B.O. 188 is not required

A2-Energy Probe 3

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 1, Page 3-4 para 6 & Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5 and Table 1

- a) Please provide more detail on historic customer additions and volume growth 2004-2012 (Board Approved) and forecast 2012-2024.**
- b) Please chart/graph the historic actuals and forecasts for each segment.**
- c) Please reconcile to the second reference.**

A2-Energy Probe 4

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5, Pages 6-9, Figures 2-5

- a) Please provide for both the Central and GTA-Project Influence Area more details on volume use by sector on peak design day 2004-2012.**
- b) Please provide by sector (using prior question as reference) or in aggregate the forecast 2012-2024.**

A2-Energy Probe 5

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5, Table 2 & Exhibit A, Tab3, Schedule 5

Please provide a version of Table 2 with a column for the Board-approved Peak Day Design gas supply portfolio and one for the first full year of the GTA project operation 2015/16.

- a) Comment on any material changes.**
- b) If not covered above, please explain any forecast pathway, services and toll changes related to the NEB Decision on TCPL Services and Tolls.**

A2-Energy Probe 6

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab3, Schedule 5, Attachment Table A4

- a) Please provide a version of the referenced Table showing the baseline GTA supply and transportation costs for each Scenario- Current 2012 and Future 2015/16 contracting with and without the GTA Project and the Union Kirkwall to Parkway build.**
- b) Please provide explanations of assumptions and results.**
- c) Confirm/reconcile the costs to those shown in Exhibit E/Tab1/Schedule 1 Page 8-9-Input assumptions.**

A2-Energy Probe 7

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit E, Tab1, Schedule 1, Page 8-9-Input assumptions

Preamble: The reference shows the following average use data (10³m³)-Residential 2568, Commercial 20230, Apartment 154877, Industrial 109481.

- a) Please provide the comparable Board-approved volumes from the rebasing Rate Case. (EB-2011-0210)**

- b) Please quantify and discuss the basis of any material differences in the above input assumptions.

A2-Energy Probe 8

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit E, Tab1, Schedule 1/Page 3, Para 10

Please provide a breakout that shows how many customer additions are related to future Transmission and Distribution System Expansion(s) 2017 \$21m; 2018 \$16.4m, 2019 \$13m.; 2020 \$0.3m.

A2-Energy Probe 9

**Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5 &
Exhibit E, Tab1, S1 Attachment**

Please provide the analysis that leads to the gas cost savings described in Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5, and calculated in Exhibit E, Tab1, Schedule 1, Attachment.

A2-Energy Probe 10

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5 Attach Table A4 &
Exhibit E, Tab1, S1 Attachment Page 1 (updated) inputs and results**

- a) Please provide the latest Board-approved Transportation cost schedule. Compare to Table A4 Increased Firm Transportation Scenario and discuss differences.
- b) Please provide the analysis that leads to the transportation tolls filed in Exhibit A Tab 3 Schedule 5 and Exhibit E, Tab1, Schedule 1, Para 11 and Schedule 1, page 8.

A2-Energy Probe 11

FYI CONFIDENTIAL IR to EGD (filed separately)

A2-Energy Probe 12

**Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 9-3A &
Schedule 11-8**

- a) Please confirm that the Incremental Capital does not include PW site acquisition and development costs.**
- b) Please provide the derivation of the \$9.2 million annual revenue amount.**
- c) Please show the derivation of the Gas Supply Cost Savings of \$28,200 million.**
- d) Reconcile to the costs and cost savings in Schedule 11-8.**
- e) Please explain why the gas cost savings are not escalated/discounted based on the projections of future gas costs in the evidence.**
- f) Please provide a version of the DCF PI Analysis (schedule 9-3A) that includes the approximately \$90 million of PW acquisition and development capital**

Issue A3 Are the costs of the facilities and rate impacts to customers appropriate?

A3-Energy Probe 13

Ref: EB-2012-0433 Exhibit B, page 2, paras. 3 and 5.

Preamble: The PW site and LCU facilities Capital cost will be \$203 million. The first year (2015) net cost (revenue requirement) is \$15.3 million. Confirm Union proposes that of this \$15.3 m net cost, \$17.4 million is recovered from ex-franchise customers and a \$2.1 million reduction in in-franchise customers.

- a) Confirm that not all in-franchise rate classes will see a reduction.**
- b) Confirm Ex franchise rate increase M12 is \$17.4 million or \$0.078GJ/d to \$0.088 GJ/d i.e. an increase of \$0.01.GJ/d.**
- c) How much of this increase will be experienced by each of EGD, TCPL and Gaz Metro? Please provide estimates of rates and costs before and after GTA Project implementation.**

- d) **Confirm that rates will increase at January 1, 2016 (Section1 para 9).**
- e) **Please explain the functioning of the proposed differal/variance account to track cost differences between approved costs and final costs after implementation. For example, is it based on capital costs or rate base?**

GTA Project

FYI CONFIDENTIAL IRs Filed Separately

A3-Energy Probe 14

A3-Energy Probe 15

Issue A3 What are the alternatives to the proposed facilities? Are any alternatives to the proposed facilities preferable to the proposed facilities?

A4-Energy Probe 16

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 9-2, Page 1

Preamble: Wish to clarify how the Parkway West Site and development costs are allocated for Economic Feasibility and Rate recovery.

- a) **Please confirm which alternatives were examined for acquisition and development of the new Parkway West site.**
- b) **Does Union agree that the major PW project costs are the cost of site acquisition and development on west side of 407 other than the cost of adding the LCU at the current Parkway site?**
- c) **Please explain why allocating the (\$90.6 million) site acquisition and development costs of the new Parkway West site development to either the GTA and/or Brantford-Kirkwall Projects (including Parkway D) would NOT more appropriately meet the Board's E.B.O. 134 and E.B.O. 188 Guidelines?**

A4-Energy Probe 17

**Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 9-3A, Pages 1-3 &
Schedule 9-3B, Pages 1- 3**

- a) Please provide a live Excel spreadsheet corresponding to the first referenced schedule that includes an updated list of all input assumptions (Schedule 9-5).**
- b) Provide a copy of the live spreadsheet corresponding to the second reference including an updated list of all assumptions.**
- c) Please provide more discussion on why Schedule 9-3A is more appropriate.**
- d) Please provide a revised version of Schedule 9-3A with the changed assumption that the Parkway West site acquisition and development costs are added to the Station Costs for Parkway D**
- e) Please discuss the result.**

A4-Energy Probe 18

**Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 10-1Page 1 &
Schedule 10-2 and Schedule 10-3**

- a) Please provide revenue requirement calculations for the Parkway-Kirkwall project assuming that PW site acquisition and development costs of about \$90 million are included in the cost on top of the current \$108 million of Station project costs***
- b) Comment on the result and the Rate implications**
- c) Please update Schedule 10-2 assuming revenue requirement includes costs of PW site acquisition and development are included**
- d) Please update Schedule 10-3 assuming revenue requirement and rates includes costs of PW site acquisition and development (if not part of indirect costs)**

A4-Energy Probe 19

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 10-6, Page 1, M12 rate Impacts

Please provide the estimated annual \$ impact of the projects on existing and new M12 shippers, including Gaz Metro and Enbridge. Assume PW site costs are allocated to all shippers.

A4-Energy Probe 20

Ref: EB-2012-0433 Section 10, page 88, para 27 &
EB-2013-0074 Section 8, Page 9 *Compression Alternatives*

Preamble: While Union continues project development activities, it is discussing the potential of purchasing and installing a used compressor unit from the TCPL compressor fleet. Union will need to complete the evaluation of the feasibility of a used compressor by the end of April 2013.

- a) Please advise whether new and refurbished unit(s) were/are for Parkway West (new LCU unit costs \$33.9 million (Schedule 11.1)) and for Parkway Comp. D.
- b) Describe/provide the analysis of whether a new or refurbished Parkway LCU is feasible/required for each compressor.
- c) Please provide a summary enquiries to TCPL regarding repurposing one of their mainline compressors as an option to a new/refurbished 44,500 cfm compressor for either/or Parkway D or LCU.
- d) Please provide copies of correspondence and comparable costs for each unit.
- e) What was/is Union's decision regarding new or refurbished compressors?
- d) In particular, describe in detail why a refurbished unit would not be suitable for the PW LCU given its low duty cycle.

A4-Energy Probe 21

Ref: EB-2012-0433 Section 4, pages 35-36 para. 36, Schedule 4-4 &
EB-2013-0074 Schedule 6-1, Page 1

Preamble: Wish to clarify existing awn-Parkway contracts (no Notice Received) Kirkwall –Parkway Application and continued de-contracting of Dawn-Kirkwall capacity.

- a) Please update Schedule 6-1 to provide sections on forecast 2014- forward projected de-contracting Dawn-Kirkwall.
- b) Please provide a summary schedule of total capacity contracted relative to total capacity available for the period 2014-2024.

- c) With regard to TCPL new contracts Parkway to Maple that will add 400Bcf/day of capacity requirement -are these contracts signed yet? If not are they subject to NEB approval.

A4-Energy Probe 22

Ref: EB-2013-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 7, para. 3 (b)- DSM & Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 5, Figure 5

Please explain/reconcile the statements (in part b) that indicate certain conservation measures increase peak demand to the referenced Figure 5 that appears to show since 2007 when EGDs DSM programs ramped up:

- the ratio of peak and average consumption declined
- in the same period technologies such as tankless water heaters penetrated the market.

A4-Energy Probe 23

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 7, para 5 Figure 1

- a) Please provide the size of curtailable load relative to Central Region peak day demand for commercial and industrial customers.
- b) Please provide a list of factors such as rates, penalties, gas costs and the relative contribution to reductions in curtailable load that have resulted in interruptible customers going firm.
- c) Please provide information on EGDs forecast of curtailable load from 2013-2025.

A4-Energy Probe 24

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit A, Tab 4, Schedule 4, Table 3 & Exhibit A, Tab 3, Schedule 7, Pg. 12 Figure 3

- a) Please extend Table 3 to show 2005-2025 Peak Day demand and throughput.
- b) Please provide a list of current entry points and their current average and maximum design day maximum flows relative to the total GTA demand.

- c) Please provide a modified entry point listing showing the additional capacity from each of the potential alternatives in Figure 3.
- d) Provide a perspective on which new entry points could collectively meet the forecast demand in Table 3.

Issue A5 Is the proposed timing of the various components of the projects appropriate?

A5-Energy Probe 25

Ref: EB-2012-0451

What will the additional costs if approval is not received by July 31 2013?

- Land option (July 31)
- Equipment
- Contractor costs

A5-Energy Probe 26

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 11

Preamble: Union foresees no issues obtaining material for the proposed Parkway D Compressor within the proposed timelines and no problem obtaining a contractor to complete the proposed construction.

Please discuss the information Union is relying on to support the above statement.

A5-Energy Probe 27

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 11

Preamble: Due to long lead times for some of the significant components of the proposed compressor, Union is required to place orders for these significant components in the fall of 2013.

- a) Please provide a list of the significant components.
- b) What is the potential impact on the project if the orders are not placed in the fall of 2013?

SPECIFIC ISSUES FOR EACH APPLICATION

B. Union Gas Limited - Parkway West (EB-2012-0433)

Issue B1 Do the facilities address the OEB Environmental Guidelines for Hydrocarbon Pipelines as applicable?

B1-Energy Probe 28

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Section 13, Page 114, paragraph 32

Preamble: The evidence indicates Union and Stantec believe the consultation program held for the original proposal is acceptable as the proposed NPS42 pipeline still falls within the original Study Area and pipeline routing area.

- a) Please discuss when and how all stakeholders have been advised of the change in the original proposal and the elimination of the need for the two NPS54 pipelines and reducing the length of the NPS pipeline by 600 metres.
- b) Please discuss if there is a change in interested and affected parties as a result of the design change.
- c) Please discuss the need for a second public meeting to discuss the updated preferred route.

B1-Energy Probe 29

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Section 13, Page 115

Please discuss why an Environmental Report was not completed for the pipeline replacement.

B1-Energy Probe 30

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Page 1.2

- a) Please confirm the date Union's Environmental Report (ER) for the Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project was circulated to the OPCC.
- b) Please provide the comments received from the OPCC on the ER.

- c) Please confirm the date of the change in the design and the elimination of the need for the two 54 inch pipelines.
- d) Please discuss if the OPCC has been advised of the change and provide any correspondence and a description of issues raised by the OPCC.

B1-Energy Probe 31

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Page 2.4

Preamble: The evidence indicates one instance of public input was received by the project team through email.

Please provide Union's response to the concerns raised.

B1-Energy Probe 32

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Page 2.4 Agency Input

- a) Please explain why the Ministry of Transportation indicated their preference for the Preliminary Proposed Routes over the Potential Alternative Routes.
- b) Please provide the email response to the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs regarding mitigation of impacts to agricultural lands.

B1-Energy Probe 33

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Page 2.6 Compilation and Incorporation of Input

- a) Please provide a description of any remaining outstanding issues.
- b) Please discuss how public input has been taken into account in any decisions made regarding routing and siting decisions as well as mitigation and monitoring issues for the preferred route.

B1-Energy Probe 34

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Page 3.1 Effects Assessment

- a) Please provide a description of the proposed construction methods for the pipeline.**
- b) Please develop a Project-Environment Interaction Matrix that shows the interaction (use x = interaction; N/A if not applicable) between the construction activities for the pipeline and each specific environmental features for each project discussed in 3.0 Effects Assessment.**

B1-Energy Probe 35

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012

- a) Page 3.2 - Please identify watercourse crossings that may require blasting.**
- b) Page 3.2 - Please identify the watercourse where potential effects to physiographic features may occur.**
- c) Page 3.3 - Please discuss the party/individual with the authority to make the decision to temporarily halt construction activities due to excessively wet soil conditions.**
- d) Page 3.9 – Please provide the status of the recommended vascular plant survey east of Highway 407 in the spring of 2013 to confirm the results of the August 2012 survey which identified no plant species of conservation concern.**
- e) Page 3.9 – Please provide the status of the recommended field survey in the spring of 2013 to confirm the presence/absence of grassland bird species in the cultural meadows, salamanders in the swamp vegetation community and calling amphibians in the marsh vegetation communities.**
- f) Please discuss Union's ability to avoid clearing activities requiring the removal of trees or shrubs during the migratory bird nesting period (May 1 to July 31).**

- g) Please discuss Union's policy regarding implementation of a waste management program consisting of reduction, reuse and recycling of materials.
- h) Page 3.13 – Please discuss if Union plans to undertake a pre-construction soil sampling program for the agricultural field.
- i) Page 3.14 – Please confirm the status of archaeological assessment activities to be conducted in the spring of 2013.
- j) Page 3.14 – Please discuss how Union informed First Nation and Metis representatives of the change to one 42 inch natural gas pipeline. Please provide a copy of all correspondence.
- k) Page 4.2 – Please provide the rationale for selecting 100 m as the boundary around the Pipeline Routing Area for the cumulative effects assessment.

B1-Energy Probe 36

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Appendix A

Please confirm the length of pipe installed by open trench versus boring.

B1-Energy Probe 37

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012, Appendix B3

- a) The July 17, 2012 letter to Community references a June 13, 2012 letter. Please provide a copy of this letter.
- b) Please provide a copy of the figures included with the July 17, 2012 letter.

B1-Energy Probe 38

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Schedule 13-4, Parkway West Natural Gas Pipeline Project Environmental Report, November 2012

Please provide a breakdown of total estimated environmental costs related to pre-construction, construction and post construction activities.

Issue B4 Has there been adequate consultation with any affected First Nations or Metis communities?

B4-Energy Probe 39

Ref: EB-2012-0433, Section 13, Page 121

Preamble: The evidence indicates Union is currently working on coordinating information meetings with the two Metis Community Councils in January 2013.

- a) Please provide the status of these meetings and a summary of issues raised and Union's response.
- b) Please provide an update on overall consultations with First Nations and Metis in 2013 and include a summary of issues raised and Union's response.

C. Union Gas Limited - Brantford-Kirkwall / Parkway D (EB-2013-0074)

Issue C1 Do the facilities address the OEB Environmental Guidelines for Hydrocarbon Pipelines as applicable?

C1-Energy Probe 40

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 12, Page 4

Preamble: The evidence indicates that the proposed pipeline design includes two different grades of pipe and two different wall thicknesses.

Please provide the total estimated pipe length of the two different grades of pipe.

C1-Energy Probe 41

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 12, Page 7

Preamble: Union indicates it will construct the proposed pipeline in accordance with its current construction procedures.

Please provide a copy of Union's current construction procedures.

C1-Energy Probe 42

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 12, Page 7

Preamble: Union indicates that prior to tendering the construction contract it will contact each Landowner along the route prior to construction to obtain site specific requirements.

Please confirm the number of Landowners along the pipeline route.

C1-Energy Probe 43

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 12, Page 8

Preamble: Union retains a qualified drainage consultant to contact Landowners and prepare a tiling plan.

Please discuss when the drainage consultant will be retained and the timing for completion of the tiling plan in the context of the overall construction schedule.

C1-Energy Probe 44

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 12

Please provide a Project-Environment Interaction Matrix that shows the interaction (x = interaction; N/A if not applicable) between the construction activities for the pipeline and Parkway D Compressor Station and each specific environmental features for each project discussed in Schedule 12-3, Schedule 12-4 & Schedule 12-5.

C1-Energy Probe 45

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12-5, Page 2.1

Preamble: The evidence indicates Union tracked members of the public who communicated with project staff and a Landowner contact list was developed through property tax roll data. The public and landowner lists have not been provided for confidentiality reasons.

Please provide a summary of the comments received from members of the public and landowners regarding the project and include dates and Union's response.

C1-Energy Probe 46

Ref: Environmental Guidelines for the Location, Construction and Operation of Hydro Carbon Pipelines and Facilities in Ontario, 6th Edition 2011

Preamble: The Board's Environmental Guidelines provide information requirements for new projects to be approved by the Board.

- a) **Page 8 – Please provide all correspondence from the OPCC related to the Brantford-Kirkwall Pipeline project and/or the Parkway D Compressor project.**
- b) **Page 17 - Please provide a matrix of any outstanding issues related to the Brantford-Kirkwall Pipeline project and/or the Parkway D Compressor project.**
- c) **Page 46 – Please provide a tabular summary of causes of cumulative effects, a cumulative effects description, recommended mitigation measures, all residual effects and approaches to deal with residual effects.**
- d) **Please provide a table of notifications, permits and approvals by agency that may be required.**

C1-Energy Probe 47

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12-5, Page 2.1

Preamble: The evidence states that it is the opinion of Stantec that no additional parties are required to be notified for the Station site.

Does Union agree with Stantec that no additional parties are required to be notified for the Station site?

C1-Energy Probe 48

Ref 1: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12-4, Letter, Page 5

Ref 2: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 16

Preamble: At Reference 1, the evidence states "While it is unlikely that the 2008 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment contains elements that are inconsistent with the 2011 archaeological guidelines, nonetheless the assessment should be revisited by a licensed archaeologist during the Stage 2 process to ensure it is consistent with the new archaeological guidelines". At reference 2, the evidence states "An archaeological assessment will be completed by a licensed archaeological firm along the pipeline route and at the Parkway West Compressor Station, as recommended in each ER. Union proposes to complete the archaeological assessment during the 2013 to 2014 field season.

Please confirm the assessment described at Reference 1 will be undertaken as part of the archaeological assessment during the 2013 to 2014 field season.

C1-Energy Probe 49

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12-5

- a) Page 3.3 – Please provide the status of the additional field investigation to be undertaken in the spring of 2013 to confirm the categorization of the on-site water feature and provide any updates.**
- b) Page 3.7 – Please explain the role of Union's Environmental Planner compared to the Environmental Inspector.**
- c) Page 3.8 – Please discuss if Union anticipates its clearing activities will occur during the migratory bird nesting period (May 1 to July 31).**
- d) Page 3.9 – Please discuss the timing of the municipal Site Plan Review Process.**
- e) Page 3.11 – Please discuss Union's plans to reuse and recycle construction materials.**

C1-Energy Probe 50

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12

If the application is approved by the Board, please confirm it is Union's intent to provide a construction schedule to all directly affected landowners before the commencement of construction on their property.

Issue C2 Are there any outstanding landowner matters for the proposed facilities' routing and construction? For greater clarity, landowners include parties from whom permits, crossing agreements and other approvals are required.

C2-Energy Probe 51

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 20

- a) Please confirm the number of permanent easements and temporary easements required for the pipeline project.**
- b) Please discuss the status of Union's negotiations with individual Landowners for the pipeline project.**
- c) Please discuss if Union has identified and communicated with tenants as either directly affected or indirectly affected for both projects.**

Issue C3 Are the proposed facilities designed in accordance with current technical and safety requirements?

C3-Energy Probe 52

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 9

Preamble: The evidence indicates the plant will include all main gas piping and equipment, auxiliary support systems, and safety systems required for a facility of this nature and scope.

Please discuss the safety systems required and the applicable safety standards and/or guidelines for a facility of this nature/scope.

Issue C4 Has there been adequate consultation with any affected First Nations and Metis communities?

C4-Energy Probe 53

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 24, Figure 12-6

Preamble: Figure 12-6 shows the date of the initial notification letter sent to First Nations and Metis. In the evidence three First Nation groups are not listed as requesting that Union conduct formal consultations and or engagement meetings with them.

Please provide additional details on Union's contact with these three groups and if Union has continued and maintained communications regarding the project. Please include a listing of the dates of any phone calls, meetings etc.

C4-Energy Probe 54

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Schedule 12, Page 25

- a) Please provide written documentation of the notes or minutes that may have been taken at meetings or from phone calls, or letters received from Aboriginal Peoples.**
- b) Please provide a description of the issues or concerns that have been raised by Aboriginal Peoples in respect of the project and, where applicable, how these issues or concerns will be mitigated or accommodated.**
- c) Please discuss how Union plans to continue engaging with Aboriginal Peoples as the pipeline and Parkway projects move forward to identify potential impacts to traditional land uses.**
- d) Please confirm Union will provide a copy of the completed archaeological assessments for the project, not just the First Nations or Metis that request a copy.**

Issue C7 If the Board approves the proposed facilities, what conditions, if any, are appropriate?

C7-Energy Probe 55

Ref: EB-2013-0074 Section 10, Page 5, Page 13, Figure 11-4 and Page 17, Figure 11-5

Preamble: In EB-2008-0280, the Board issued Guidelines for the pre-approval of long term natural gas supply and/or upstream transportation contracts.

- a) Please explain why each of the proposed TCPL contracts and associated cost is material in the context of Union's current gas supply and transportation portfolios for the EDA and NDA.**
- b) Please provide a list of new significant/material upstream transportation Union contracted for in the past 10 years. Indicate if Board pre-approval was obtained.**
- c) What are the risks to Union if preapproval is not obtained, given the other conditions precedent in this case and at the NEB (TCPL Union and EGD).**
- d) What are the risks to ratepayers if the conditions precedent are not met. Please discuss and in particular, the cost consequences?**

D. Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. - GTA Project (EB-2012-0451)

Issue D1 Do the facilities address the OEB Environmental Guidelines for Hydrocarbon Pipelines as applicable?

D1-Energy Probe 56

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 3

Preamble: Enbridge indicates that by selecting a route through previously disturbed rights-of-way, the Preferred Route minimizes the potential disturbance to environmental and socio-economic features and results in no net loss of local resources.

Please explain more fully the term "no net loss of local resources", in the context of Dillon's Environmental Report and Attachments filed at Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1.

D1-Energy Probe 57

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 2, Page 1

Preamble: The evidence provides a list of factors considered during the identification of alternative routes. This criteria was used to identify several alternatives for both segments.

- a) Please confirm the total number of alternative routes considered for each segment.**
- b) Please describe how the criteria were applied and how the analysis was undertaken to identify alternatives.**
- c) Please discuss if relative weightings for each factor/criterion was considered in the analysis.**

D1-Energy Probe 58

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 1

Preamble: EGDI assumes that if all mitigation measures are put in place, there will be no significant net effect anticipated during the construction and/or operation of the pipeline.

- a) Please confirm potential impacts exist if certain mitigation measures such as the following are not adhered to:**
 - Page 173 - Cold watercourses crossings July 1st to September 15th.**
 - Page 173 – Warm and cool watercourses crossings July 1st to March 15th.**
 - Timing windows proposed by MNR.**
 - Page 180 – Clear trees and shrubs outside the breeding bird window (April 1st to July 31st).**
- b) Please discuss EGDI's response if certain mitigation measures cannot be implemented.**

D1-Energy Probe 59

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 2

Preamble: The Stage 1 Archaeological Study was carried out for Segment A and Segment B by D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc.

- a) Please provide the Terms of Reference for the study.**
- b) The Stage 1 background study included an optional property inspection. Please confirm if a property inspection was conducted.**

D1-Energy Probe 60

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 4, Page 2

Preamble: The evidence indicates that EGDI revised the scope of Segment A of the GTA project as a reflection of continuing design and stakeholder consultation work.

- a) Please provide further details on the stakeholder consultation work that contributed to the revised scope.**
- b) Please provide a summary of the discussions with TransCanada including meeting dates, parties involved, outcome of discussions that resulted in the change in the starting point of Segment A.**

D1-Energy Probe 61

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 4

- a) Please provide a summary of the EA requirements for the projects under EB-2012-0451.**
- b) Please provide a summary of any outstanding issues from the GTA Project Environmental Report.**

D1-Energy Probe 62

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 4, Page 3 & Environmental Report September 20, 2012, Page 94, Table 12 Segment A: Detailed Evaluation of Alternative Routes

Please update Table 12 in the Environmental Report to reflect the proposed changes to Segment A.

D1-Energy Probe 63

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 4, Page 6

- a) Please discuss the specific conditions that would result in opportunities to narrow the construction working space to reduce impacts in environmentally sensitive areas.**
- b) The evidence states the new proposed location of the Parkway West Gate Station does not contain any sensitive natural areas. Please confirm the source of this information.**
- c) Please discuss further the need for Union Gas to construct two additional approximately 1,500 m long 54-inch pipelines.**

D1-Energy Probe 64

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 5, Pages 11-16

- a) Please confirm the start date and scope of the remainder of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and when the study is expected to be completed.**
- b) Please discuss the criteria that would result in a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment for the GTA project.**
- c) In the event artifacts are discovered during the project, please confirm it is Enbridge's intent to limit notification to First Nation and Metis communities that have expressed an interest during the course of the project.**
- d) Page 2 of the letter to First Nations and Metis Groups states that requests to inform some communities of the results of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment work were received and therefore a summary of the assessments will be circulated once complete.**

- e) Please confirm the parties that will receive the results of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment work.
- f) Please provide the status of the TRCA's archaeological assessment of the segment of the proposed pipeline that extends through the Claireville Conservation Area.
- g) Please compare the scope of the TRCA's work compared to D.R. Poulton & Associates.
- h) Please discuss potential significant results and a potential amendment that could result in this application.

D1-Energy Probe 65

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, Executive Summary, Page xii

Preamble: The evidence states that mitigation measures were identified that conform to EGDI's *Construction and Maintenance Manual, 2012* and EGDI's *Environmental Guidelines for Construction, 2012*.

Please provide a copy of each document.

D1-Energy Probe 66

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 1.0 Introduction, Page 15

- a) Please provide the design details/specification for Class 4 pipeline.
- b) Please explain why Segment A will be designed with a maximum operating pressure (MOP) of 935 psig and the design MOP for Segment B is 650 psis.

D1-Energy Probe 67

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 1

- a) Page 17 – Please confirm the length of pipeline (Segment B) that is located within the public use Utility designation in the Parkway Belt compared to the two sections that exit the Parkway Belt.

- b) **Page 18 – Please confirm the date the Environmental Report was circulated to the OPCC and provide a summary of issues raised by the OPCC.**
- c) **Page 122 – MNR indicates that a Terms of Reference is needed for studies to be conducted that are of interest to MNR. Please provide an update on the studies to be conducted and the status of the Terms of Reference.**
- d) **Page 138 – Please confirm if the issues identified by CVC (Constraints Regarding Segment A) resulted in a deviation to the Preliminary Preferred Route to an area slightly south of the alignment where there are fewer sensitive features.**
- e) **Page 164 - Please update the project-environment interaction matrix (Table 30) as required to reflect the design change to Segment A and identify the updates.**
- f) **Please provide a concise list of refinements to the design of Segment A, Segment B and the Jones-Eglinton Regulation Facility under the categories Biophysical, Socio-Economic and Technical.**
- g) **Please provide an update on efforts to contact First Nation and Metis communities where no confirmation of receipt of project information has occurred.**
- h) **Page 146 - Please summarize the project refinements implemented as a result of First Nations and Metis Feedback.**
- i) **Page 163 – The pipeline will be installed via open trench or trenchless construction methods. Please provide an estimate of the length of pipe to be installed open trench versus trenchless.**
- j) **Page 175 – During the project construction, please confirm the party that will have the authority to halt construction should it be required as an environmental mitigation measure.**
- k) **Page 180 – Please confirm if EGDI plans to provide environmental awareness training for all workers.**
- l) **Page 199 – Please provide any updates on planned projects in the study area related to projects and timing.**

- m) Please provide EGDI's waste management plan during construction.
- n) Please discuss if EGDI has identified and communicated with tenants as either directly affected or indirectly affected landowners for both projects.

D1-Energy Probe 68

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 3.1.2 Groundwater, Pages 42-43

- a) EGDI's evidence refers to four measured water levels from a possible 14 available wells. Please discuss if water levels from the remaining available wells will be measured.
- b) Please confirm the safe excavation limit regarding artesian conditions.

D1-Energy Probe 69

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 3.2.2 Wetlands, Page 47

Please confirm the number of tributaries not sampled.

D1-Energy Probe 70

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 4.0 Route Selection Overview, Pages 82-84

Preamble: The evidence provides a description of alternative routes for Segment A (A1, A2 & A3) and Segment B (BEW1, BEW2, BEW3, BEW4, BNS1, BNS2, BNS3, BNS4).

Please provide a table to show the proposed length of pipe for each alternative for Segment A and Segment B.

D1-Energy Probe 71

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 4.2 High-Level Route Evaluation, Page 85

Preamble: The evidence indicates the evaluation criteria were developed in part to reflect the professional experience of Dillon and EGDI staff from previous studies of a similar nature.

Please provide a list of previous studies of a similar nature.

D1-Energy Probe 72

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.2.2 Landowners, Page 113

Please confirm the number of lands privately owned separately for Segment A and Segment B.

D1-Energy Probe 73

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.3 Pre-Consultation, Page 113

Page 113 - Please explain how it was decided that Segment C would not be pursued as part of the GTA project.

D1-Energy Probe 74

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.3.6 Data Collection and Document Review, Page 128

Preamble: The evidence states that data collected from municipal and regional governments, and provincial agencies included documents, reports and mapping within 100 meters of the route alternatives.

Please provide the rationale for the 100 metres.

D1-Energy Probe 75

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.4.1
Correspondence and Notification, Page 129**

Please discuss if a NOC for the project was placed in the Toronto Star, The Globe or the National Post. If not, why not.

D1-Energy Probe 76

**Ref 1: EB-2012-0451 1: Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.4.1
Segments A and B Study Area Correspondence and Notification, Page 129,
Table 19**

**Ref 2: EB-2012-0451 2: Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.10.1
Segments A and B Study Area Correspondence and Notification, Page 154,
Table 26**

Preamble: The Segment A and B newspaper circulation differs for Open House 1 and Open House 2.

Please explain.

D1-Energy Probe 77

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.6 First
Set of Open Houses Page 132**

- a) Please confirm if environmental impacts were included in the topics covered at the first set of open houses.**
- b) Please confirm the screened out routes identified as part of the initial high level evaluation were not shown at the Open House.**

D1-Energy Probe 78

**Ref 1: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.10
Second Set of Open Houses and Preferred Route, Page 153**

**Ref 2: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.4
Initial Project Mailout – Notice of Commencement and Letters, Page 129**

Preamble: At reference 1, the evidence indicates the notice for Segments A and B regarding the second set of open houses was mailed to over 70,000 potentially directly or indirectly affected residences, farms and businesses located approximately 1 km on either side (2 km span) of the preferred routes. At reference 2, the mailing was to over 140,000 potentially directly or indirectly affected residences, farms and businesses located approximately 1 km on either side (2 km span) of the preferred routes.

Please explain why the notice was sent to 140,000 for the first set of open houses and only 70,000 for the second set of open houses.

D1-Energy Probe 79

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.11
Second Set of Open Houses, Page 156**

Preamble: The first set of open houses had a total of six open houses. The second set of open houses had a total of three open houses.

Please provide the rationale for the change in the number of open houses.

D1-Energy Probe 80

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.11.3
Consultation Feedback from Open Houses, Page 161**

When does Enbridge plan to have detailed construction plans and schedules completed.

D1-Energy Probe 81

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.13
Ongoing Commitment to Communication, Page 162**

Please discuss specifically how Enbridge plans to keep residents and businesses in the study area informed of project plans, construction and mitigation activities.

D1-Energy Probe 82

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 6.0 Potential Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures along the Preferred Route, Page 163

- a) Page 163 - Please discuss specifically how Enbridge would sweep for wildlife, who would undertake this work and if formal training is required.**
- b) Page 163 - Please provide an estimate of the km of open trench versus km of trenchless construction methods anticipated for Segment A and Segment B.**
- c) Page 164 – Please provide a revised Table 30 to include interaction results for the following additional environmental features discussed: Hydrogeology, Bedrock, Seismicity, Surface Water/Wetlands, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Atmospheric Air Emissions.**
- d) Please discuss how Enbridge plans to incorporate the mitigation measures recommended in Dillon’s Environmental Report.**
- e) Page 182 – Please define the role of the recommended on-site biologist compared to the Environmental Inspector.**

Issue D2. Are there any outstanding landowner matters for the proposed facilities’ routing and construction? For greater clarity, landowners include parties from whom permits, crossing agreements and other approvals are required.

D2-Energy Probe 83

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit D, Tab 1, Schedule 2

Please provide an update on the status of the negotiations with affected landowners and Enbridge’s proposed consultation strategy with affected landowners.

Issue D3 Are the proposed facilities designed in accordance with current technical and safety requirements?

D3-Energy Probe 84

**Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Environmental Report, 5.6.3
Consultation Feedback from Open Houses, Page 136, Table 22**

Preamble: Enbridge indicates it undertakes regular inspection and maintenance of all system components.

Please provide EGDI's planned maintenance schedule for the system components of Segment A and Segment B.

Issue D4 Has there been adequate consultation with any affected First Nations or Metis communities?

D4-Energy Probe 85

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Attachment 5, Pages 11-16

- a) In the event artifacts are discovered during the project, please confirm it is Enbridge's intent to limit notification to First Nation and Metis communities that have expressed an interest during the course of the project.
- b) Page 2 of the letter to First Nations and Metis Groups states that requests to inform some communities of the results of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment work were received and therefore a summary of the assessments will be circulated once complete. Please confirm the parties that will receive the results of the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment work.
- c) Please discuss Enbridge's plans to follow-up with First Nation and Metis communities that have not been successfully contacted

Issue D5 Should approval of Enbridge's proposed rate methodology for the service to be provided to TransCanada be granted?

D5-Energy Probe 86

FYI CONFIDENTIAL IR to EGD (filed separately)

D5-Energy Probe 87

Ref: EB-2012-0451 Exhibit E, Tab1, Schedule 2, Attachment

- a) Confirm calculation shown in reference is for NPS 42" full shared use option. Provide an equivalent calculation of the revenue requirement for the standalone (EGD sole use).**
- b) Please provide a Revenue Requirement for the other partial shared use options.**
- c) Assume TCPL does not renew the TSE after 15 years provide the Revenue Requirement impact on EGD.**
- d) For each of the revenue requirement calculations provide the annual revenue from TCPL rate 332 service and the transportation margin to EGD.**
- e) Please provide full details of the Costs allocated to Rate 332.**
- f) Please provide details of the rate design for Rate 332.**