**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #4**

Reference: TCPL Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 2, line 21 and following

Preamble: It is TransCanada's intent today and always has been to use its capacity on Segment A on an open access basis to serve customers wishing to move gas on the Mainline.

Request: Please indicate whether TCPL will/will not contract for capacity on the revised Segment A and if so under what conditions.

Response:

If Enbridge agrees to honour its obligations under the MOU, TransCanada will have the right to capacity on Segment A consistent with the MOU.

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #5**

Reference: TCPL Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 2, lines 35-37 and following[sic]

Preamble: TransCanada's original evidence in this proceeding was premised on the February 12th version of Enbridge's GTA Project. The parts of that evidence that are not premised on the MOU remain valid; this supplementary evidence addresses the further Amended Application.

Request: Please indicate in summary form, which parts of TCPLs July 5, 2013 evidence do not remain valid.

Response:

On review of TransCanada's originally filed evidence TransCanada can confirm that it all remains valid.

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #6**

Reference: TCPL Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 2, line 35-37 and following[sic]

Preamble: The premise of the Amended (EGD) Application and of the Union compression and looping applications being considered in these proceedings is that there will be available capacity on Segment A above the Enbridge distribution requirements and an interconnection between whatever pipeline takes gas from Albion, to the Mainline near Vaughan. That premise is the subject of a contested proceeding before the National Energy Board.

Request:

a) Please provide extract(s) of the main relief requested in the cited NEB applications.

b) Please indicate in some detail, why TCPL is indicating there will not be available capacity on the revised Segment A and also indicate what, if any, other regulatory approvals are required.

c) Has TCPL filed an application to transport gas from Albion to Maple in competition with the Union/GMi proposal? Summarize the main parameters of this Application (Capacity, Cost and In-service date, etc.).

Response:

a) On July 31, 2013, Gaz Métro and Union applied for orders from the National Energy Board:

i. requiring TransCanada to provide an interconnection with their proposed Vaughan Pipeline Project.

ii. requiring TransCanada to receive and transport Union's and Gaz Métro's gas from Vaughan to points on the Mainline downstream of Vaughan.

iii. setting "just and reasonable tolls calculated in a manner consistent with the Board's [National Energy Board's] RH-003-2011 Reasons for Decision".

b) There will be no capacity available on Segment A for Union and Gaz Métro if the Ontario Superior Court upholds the MOU between Enbridge and TransCanada, though Union and Gaz Métro (and any other shipper) will be able to contract with TransCanada for Mainline transportation that uses Segment A as part of the integrated TransCanada Mainline.

In addition to the relief they seek from the NEB in the referenced application, Union and Gaz Métro require regulatory approval to build their proposed pipeline from Albion to Vaughan, and then further regulatory approval (1) to extend their pipeline to Maple and (2) to interconnect with the Mainline at Maple. TransCanada would also need NEB approval of the facilities required for each of the Vaughan and Maple interconnections and, if the interconnections are to be useful, TransCanada would have to be ordered to construct facilities that would create capacity downstream of Vaughan and/or Maple.

c) No. TransCanada has not filed for facilities between Albion and Maple at this time. Please refer to the response to SEC IR 7.

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #7**

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence Page 4, line 18-21 (August 16, 2013)

Preamble: If the projects proceed, TransCanada's revenues will decline by approximately $455 million per year, based only on the first phase of the proposed Union / Gaz Métro bypass. The replacement revenue from short-haul service would be approximately $55 million per year. Thus the net revenue reduction experienced by TransCanada would be approximately $400 million per year.

Request:

a) Please confirm/provide data and assumptions for the Mainline de-contracting that TransCanada asserts could occur prior to the end of 2017 for
   i. EGD. Union and GMi
   ii. Indicate FT/ STFT contract termination/non-renewal assumptions and capacity and toll revenue impacts for each LDC
   iii. Directly as a result of the short-haul by-pass for each of the two projects, EGD Segment A and Union/GMi Albion to Maple

b) Relate the response and data used to TransCanada's $455 m cited above, to the 767,000 GJ/d in section 5 and projected ($960) 2017 Toll Stabilization Account (TSA) total and how much of the latter could be allocated to each of the Eastern LDCs

Response:

a) Please refer to the response to SEC 11(a) for the calculation of the revenue losses (approximately $455 million), gains (approximately $55 million) and overall revenue impact (approximately $400 million) to TransCanada as a result of the first phase of the proposed Union / Gaz Métro bypass (contracts in this Application).

Beyond the first phase of contract changes, additional lost revenue to the Mainline is likely to occur from the second phase of the proposed Parkway Extension Project where up to a total of 1,200,000 GJ/d of capacity would be built from Albion to Maple. TransCanada has calculated an additional revenue loss of approximately $330 million per year if this were to occur for a total revenue loss of approximately $730 million annually. The additional revenue loss calculation assumes a further 704,000 GJ/d is converted from long haul to short haul service. The 704,000 GJ/d represents the remaining long haul contracts on TransCanada's system serving the eastern domestic markets for Union, Gaz Métro and Enbridge, following the completion of the first phase, that could be converted to short haul service from

Maple once the Parkway Extension Project is completed. Please refer to Energy Probe 7 Attachment 1 for the additional lost revenue calculation.

b) As indicated in response (a), please refer to the response to SEC 11(a) for the calculation of the $455 million lost revenue. Within this calculation, the reduction of contracts on TransCanada system from Empress, on a GJ/d basis, totals approximately 767,000 GJ/d. $960 million is the cumulative negative impact on TransCanada's revenue between November 1, 2015 and December 31, 2017, including carrying charges on the TSA. Please refer to the response to SEC 11(a) for the specific calculation. Please refer to the response to SEC 11(c) for a discussion on cost allocation of the TSA.

Annual Lost Revenue to TransCanada - Phase II

Path	GJ/d	Current Toll ($/GJ/Month)	Annual Revenue
Empress to EGD EDA	(344,171)	49.136	(202,934,111)
Empress to GMIT EDA	(163,852)	52.601	(103,426,037)
Empress to Union EDA	(61,590)	50.201	(37,102,392)
Empress to Union NCDA	(10,756)	45.483	(5,870,562)
Empress to Union NDA	(123,826)	40.057	(59,520,806)
	(704,195)		**(408,853,908)**
Maple to EGD EDA	344,171	9.032	37,302,299
Maple to GMIT EDA	163,852	11.805	23,210,370
Maple to Union EDA	61,590	6.894	5,095,484
Maple to Union NCDA	10,756	4.740	611,742
Maple to Union NDA	123,826	10.166	15,105,246
	704,195		**81,325,141**
			(327,528,767)

TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy ProbeResearch Foundation Interrogatory #8

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 5, lines 2-5 and following.

Preamble: If Enbridge does not rely on the MOU to justify the sizing of Segment A, then its only known need is for the reinforcement of Enbridge's distribution system, and the appropriate size of Segment A is NPS 24.

Request:

a) Confirm that EGD has held an open season for capacity on the revised Segment A.

b) Confirm that TCPL has not bid into this OS and if this is not the case, the capacity and dates requested.

c) Is TCPL contesting the use of Segment A as a Transmission pipeline under the (NEB) Guidelines? If so, please explain in some detail.

d) How do the Guidelines fit/reconcile with the OEB STAR guidelines? Please discuss.

e) Further to Energy Probe IR #3 related to JT 2.37, please confirm whether TCPLwill provide the upstream capacity feeding into EGD GTA Project and if so on whatpathways, capacity and under what conditions.

Response:

a) Confirmed, the open season opened July 24, 2013 and closes September 6, 2013.

b) Confirmed, and TransCanada will not be bidding into this open season.

c) TransCanada does not understand this question. Please refer to the response to (d) below.

d) The National Energy Board does not have guidelines similar to the STAR.

e) If Enbridge honours or is ordered to comply with the MOU, TransCanada will provide the upstream capacity to Enbridge at Bram West. If Enbridge connects Segment A to the Union system at Parkway, Segment A will not require upstream capacity on the TransCanada Mainline.

TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #9

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 5, lines 16-18 and following[sic]

Preamble: TransCanada has previously determined that in the context of the configuration contemplated in the MOU, that the capacities of Segment A with NPS 36 and NPS 42 pipe are 1600 TJ/d and 2000 TJ/d respectively.

Request:

a) If shippers use Segment A for transportation from Parkway to Albion (assuming an onward connection to Maple) indicate TCPLs assessment of the sizing of Segment A for the following capacities:

357TJ/d

400TJ/d

800TJ/d

b) Please state all assumptions used for the analyses.

c) Reconcile answers to TCPL's Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Response:

a) To answer this question, TransCanada has assumed that a party other than TransCanada would both contract for capacity on Segment A, and construct a connection onward to Maple. As such, an appropriate Parkway pressure to assume is Union's Parkway West pressure of 6450 kPa. To account for the onward connection to Maple, this analysis assumes a pressure at Albion of 4900 kPa, which is in-line with the pressure required if Segment A was integrated into TransCanada's system.

TransCanada has also assumed that the question is asking about the size of Segment A for Enbridge's 800 TJ/d in addition to the listed volumes.

Assumed Pressures:

Parkway West Receipt Pressure	6450	kPa
Albion Delivery Pressure	4900	kPa

Results:

Enbridge Albion Delivery	Listed Volume (TJ/D)	Total Segment A Requirement	TCPL Recommended Pipe Size	Pipe Capability
800	357	1157	30	1295
800	400	1200	30	1295
800	800	1600	36	2072

b) Other than the receipt and delivery pressure assumptions discussed, the other assumptions are as stated in EGD 1 a).

c) TransCanada's table 4.1 and 4.2 do not assume a connection on to Maple, and as a result, are based on a delivery pressure equal to Enbridge's downstream pressure requirement (ie 3344 kPa).

TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #10

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 9 lines 29-31 and following and Table 6.1

Preamble: TransCanada submits that, especially from an LDC perspective, transportation path diversity is as important as supply diversity, because the latter goes to economic opportunities whereas the former goes to both economic opportunities and security of supply.

Request:

a) Confirm that as Footnote 9 indicates, EGD has requested 200TJ/d from Niagara on the Hamilton line.
b) Is more capacity available on this pathway and could EGD increase its diversity further.
c) Indicate any assumptions regarding incremental capacity on Niagara-Hamilton.
d) Indicate TCPLs views regarding availability of STFT and STS beyond 2015 and project this Table 6.1 to 2017/18

Response:

a) Confirmed[1].

b) Yes. TransCanada could add additional facilities to further expand this segment of its system which would provide additional firm capacity between Niagara Falls and Parkway Enbridge CDA. TransCanada could also expand its system capacity to serve the broader Enbridge CDA from Niagara.

c) TransCanada assumes the question refers to the facilities that may be required on the Hamilton Line to provide additional capacity between Niagara and Parkway Enbridge CDA. TransCanada can provide up to 200 TJ/d of capacity between Niagara and Parkway Enbridge CDA by adding minimal facilities. Expansions beyond 200 TJ/d could be achieved through various combinations of loop and compression.

d) The data in table 6.1 was compiled from Enbridge's response to Exhibit I.A1.EGD (Update).TCPL.1, in which Enbridge provides its expected contract profile in 2015. Beyond 2015, Enbridge noted in its response to Exhibit I.A1.EGD (Update).TCPL.9 that in 2016 it intends to contract for additional long haul capacity to the Enbridge CDA rather than contract for STFT. Regardless, TransCanada expects to have

[1] TransCanada holds shipper specific information confidential. However, Enbridge has granted permission to disclose this information.

sufficient long haul capacity available for customers to contract for FT or STFT service to the Enbridge CDA in the future. With respect to STS, TransCanada has sufficient capacity to meet Enbridge's current firm STS requirements. Should Enbridge require additional STS service (which is a firm transportation service) to the Enbridge CDA in the future, TransCanada would need to expand its facilities between Parkway and Maple. If Enbridge required additional STS service to the Enbridge EDA, TransCanada would potentially need to install additional facilities on either its Montreal Line or along the North Bay shortcut.

With respect to what Table 6.1 would look like as of November 1, 2017, TransCanada has relied on the information provided in Enbridge's IR responses. Enbridge indicates that it plans to contract for an additional 170 TJ/d of short haul capacity on the Union Gas and TransCanada system to replace long haul contracts to the Enbridge EDA. Based on these assumptions, TransCanada has updated Table 6.1 below:

Enbridge Contract by Path	TJ/d	% of Total
TransCanada Long-haul (includes STFT)	431*	10
TransCanada Short-haul (incudes STS)	1,124**	26
Union contracts	2,725**	64
Total	4,280	100

* Assumes Enbridge contracts for 100 TJ/d of new long haul capacity to the Enbridge CDA, and non-renews 170 TJ/d of long haul to the Enbridge EDA

** Assumes Enbridge contracts for an additional 170 TJ/d of capacity

TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #11

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 15, Chart 7.5

Request:

a) Please provide a chart that shows for 2017 the WCSB conventional and unconventional Production from Western Canada.

b) Please provide a projection/discussion of how this expanded/new production (2017) will impact the TSA and projected $905 m loss to be disposed of.

c) Please provide relevant major assumptions and support for estimates.

Response:

a) Please refer to the response to EGD 5(b).

b) and c)

As stated in TransCanada's supplemental evidence and based on its supply outlook, there will be ample volumes available from the WCSB to securely supply eastern markets in the future. The magnitude of the TSA balance on the Mainline will be dependent on whether shippers choose to use long haul transportation on the Mainline to meet their market requirements as well as the manner in which Mainline transportation services are contracted for and utilized. If shippers on the Mainline contract for long haul firm service at levels consistent with their peak requirements instead of contracting for incremental short haul service, TransCanada expects that the TSA balance at the end of 2017 will be minimal.

TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Energy Probe Research Foundation Interrogatory #12

Reference: TransCanada Supplementary Evidence (August 16, 2013) Page 17, lines 17-19

Preamble: For these reasons, TransCanada opposes the Amended Application and submits that it is not in the best interest of the nation, Ontario, or Ontario's consumers.

Request:

a) What does TCPL want the Board to do with the three specific Applications? In the response, please be specific to each application.

b) What solutions does TCPL propose to meet EGD and Union/GMi's future transportation needs?

c) Include a list of options TCPL considers viable and in the public interest.

d) Confirm whether TCPL will/will not oppose the current leave to construct applications before the NEB whether or not the OEB approves these.

e) Confirm TCPL will oppose a Union/GMi application for a transmission pipeline from Albion to Maple.

f) In each of the circumstances/scenarios discussed in the responses to the questions, please provide a summary of reasons for TCPL's position(s), including the impact on its revenues and its exposure to the TSA.

Response:

a) At this point all three applications appear to be ill-considered and premature. With the possible exceptions of (1) Segment A as a distribution reinforcement line; and (2) some level of loss of critical unit protection at Parkway there is no demonstrable benefit to any of the applied-for facilities and much uncertainty about whether they will be useful. In these circumstances, if the Board does grant leave to construct facilities beyond the exceptions mentioned above, TransCanada would recommend that the Board not grant the LDCs requests for guaranteed cost recovery.

b) TransCanada has ample existing long haul capacity to serve Enbridge, Union and Gaz Métro's existing and growth markets.

c) TransCanada's Mainline has ample existing long haul capacity. It is in Ontario's interest (and the interest of Ontario gas consumers in particular) that TransCanada serve the LDC's with existing capacity for the reason's set out in TransCanada's supplementary evidence. In summary, if the redundant infrastructure applied for in these proceedings is built by the LDCs, Ontario gas consumers will (1) incur substantial capital costs for new infrastructure, while (2) remaining at risk for the cost of the existing Mainline infrastructure, all so that (3) they can pay for the more expensive gas that is sourced at Dawn. As noted in the conclusion of TransCanada's supplementary evidence, this will represent a significant cost to Ontario gas consumers.

d) The NEB is not considering the current leave to construct applications.

e) Confirmed.

f) Please refer to the response to 12(c), above, and TransCanada's original and supplementary evidence for the particulars requested. In summary, if the LDCs meet their transportation requirements on the TransCanada Mainline, they will avoid both the costs of the proposed redundant infrastructure and reduce the risk of exposing Ontario gas consumers to the costs of a negative TSA balance.