

Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
27th. Floor
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Telephone: 416- 481-1967
Facsimile: 416- 440-7656
Toll free: 1-888-632-6273

Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario
C.P. 2319
27e étage
2300, rue Yonge
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Téléphone: 416- 481-1967
Télécopieur: 416- 440-7656
Numéro sans frais: 1-888-632-6273



BY E-MAIL

July 5, 2013

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

Dear Ms. Walli,

**Re: Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. – GTA Project (EB-2012-0451)
Union Gas Limited – Parkway West Project (EB-2012-0433) & Brantford-Kirkwall/Parkway D (EB-2013-0074)**

In accordance with Procedural Order No. 5, please find attached Board Staff Interrogatories on intervenor evidence in the above proceeding.

As a reminder, responses to interrogatories from parties who filed intervenor evidence is due by Friday, July 19, 2013.

Yours truly,

Original signed by

Josh Wasylyk
Advisor, Applications & Regulatory Audit

c. All Parties

Encl.

EB-2012-0451 – Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. GTA Project
EB-2012-0433 – Union Gas Limited Parkway West
EB-2013-0074 – Union Gas Limited Brantford-Kirkwall

Board Staff Interrogatories on Intervenor Evidence

City of Markham Evidence (Exhibit L.EGD.COM.1 & Exhibit L.EGD.COM.2)

Staff L.1 - COM

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.COM.2, page 2

Preamble

City of Markham notes that the introduction of the proposed EGD GTA Pipeline through the proposed Langstaff development area would have a major and detrimental impact on the entire plan, possibly even terminating the plan.

Questions

- a) Please discuss if the City of Markham has had any discussions with EGD regarding the location of EGD's proposed GTA Pipeline.
- b) Please discuss if the planning process for the Langstaff development allows for any further revisions to accommodate the proposed EGD GTA Pipeline.
- c) Please discuss what steps would need to be taken, and the associated time and cost adjustments needed, to accommodate EGD's GTA Pipeline in the Langstaff development area.

Staff L.2 - COM

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.COM.1, page 3

Preamble

City of Markham notes that the proposed cross-sections of Langstaff Right-of-Way ("ROW") found in Figures 2 & 3 do not contain any additional space to accommodate EGD's proposed GTA pipeline. City of Markham further notes that the cross-sections are only at the conceptual stage and have not yet been officially submitted for formal

review and approval by the City's Development Engineering or Planning and Urban Design Departments.

Questions

- a) What stage of the approval process are the Langstaff ROW cross-sections found in Figures 2 & 3 in?
- b) Please discuss if there is still an opportunity to include EGD's proposed GTA Pipeline within the Langstaff development plans.
- c) Has the City of Markham considered alternatives to the Langstaff ROW cross-section plans to include EGD's GTA Pipeline? If it has, please compare these alternatives to the preferred configuration and provide similar cross-section figures to those already filed.

Gaz Metro Limited Partnership Evidence (Exhibit L.EGD.UGL.SCGM.1)

Staff L.3 – SCGM

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.UGL.SCGM.1

Questions

- a) Please discuss Gaz Metro's plan to access gas supplies if it cannot have access to any portion, particularly Segment A, of EGD's proposed GTA Project. Please discuss facilities alternatives, such as building a new pipeline, and non-facilities alternatives, regarding the supply plan.

Environmental Defense Evidence (Exhibit L.EGD.ED.1)

Staff L.4 – ED

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.ED.1, Executive Summary, Page 2 of 24

Preamble

ED notes that the forecast annual average peak demand reduction potential through DSM presented in its evidence yields a total of 48,000 m³/hr (35.9 TJ/day) at the top quartile level, which is considered readily attainable in the timeframe involved.

Questions

- a) Please provide the estimated cost investments into DSM that would be required in order to meet the forecast annual average peak demand reduction potential.
- b) Please discuss the increase in market penetration (i.e. increase in participants) that would need to be realized in order for the forecast annual average peak demand reduction potential to be achieved.
- c) Please discuss the timeframe needed to ramp up EGD's current DSM plan to one that achieves the forecast annual average peak demand reduction potential.

Staff L.5 – ED

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.ED.1, page 13 of 24, Performance Based Conservation

- a) Please discuss and provide examples and annual savings results of other jurisdictions that employ performance based conservation for natural gas DSM.
- b) Please provide examples of other natural gas utilities in North America that have avoided or reduced an infrastructure expansion project due to the successful implementation of increased DSM funding. If there are examples, please explain what was reduced or avoided.

Green Energy Coalition Evidence (Exhibit L.EGD.GEC.1 & Exhibit L.EGD.GEC.2)

Staff L.6 – GEC

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.GEC.2, page 8, Table 3

Preamble

GEC provides a table of gas savings as a percentage of sales and compares EGD to other leaders across North America.

Questions

- a) Please provide a table, similar to Table 3, which shows the total gas savings in total volumes (m³) as a result of DSM as opposed to a percentage of annual sales.

Staff L.7 – GEC

REF: Exhibit L.EGD.GEC.2, page 12, Table 5

Preamble

GEC provides a table of incremental annual achievable savings potential across all sectors in the Greater Toronto Area.

Questions

- a) Please provide annual DSM cost estimates that would be needed to meet the potential incremental annual achievable savings outlined in Table 5.

- b) Please discuss the increase in market penetration (i.e. increase in participants) that would be needed to achieve the potential incremental annual achievable savings outlined in Table 5.