

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario Interrogatory #1**

- Reference:** TCPL Supplemental Evidence, page 4, lines 10-17
- Preamble:** 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.
- Request:** Please provide the NEB approved cost allocation methodologies from RH-003-2011 that would be used to dispose of the ratepayer portion of the balances in the TSA account at the end of 2017.
- a. If the NEB has not approved disposition methodologies for this account, what assumptions has TCPL used to allocate costs to Ontario consumers?

Response:

In the RH-003-2011 Decision, the NEB did not provide an allocation method for disposing of the TSA balance at the end of 2017. The Decision states that, on disposition of the TSA balance, the entirety of a negative balance will be borne by TransCanada's shippers, provided that the Mainline's fundamental risk has not materialized. Please refer to the response to SEC 11 for TransCanada's position on what portion of these costs may ultimately be borne by Ontario consumers.

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario Interrogatory #2**

- Reference:** TCPL Supplemental Evidence, page 7-8
- Preamble:** 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.
- Request:** Please provide the calculations and all underlying assumptions used to estimate the impacts in Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.
- a. Please provide all sources of market forecasts that TCPL currently uses for its system planning.
 - b. Without direct attribution to the specific provider if confidential, the respective forecasts for the basis differential from Empress to Dawn for the annual periods starting:
 - i. November 1, 2015
 - ii. November 1, 2016

Response:

Please refer to the response to Union 11 for the calculations for Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5

- a) TransCanada develops system planning forecasts internally using a variety of information including customer confidential discussions, consultants views, industry research, expert advice, engineering expertise, etc. Creating this list is onerous and irrelevant to this proceeding.
- b) A gas year (Nov 1 – Oct 31) price forecast is unavailable. Rather, please refer to the response to Enbridge 4(a) for a calendar year forecast of the desired price differential.

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario Interrogatory #3**

Reference: TCPL Supplemental Evidence, page 11-16

Preamble: 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.

Request: Please provide TCPL's forecast of gas available to the Empress receipt point in 2003-2025 given projected exports through BC and intra-Alberta utilization.

Response:

Please refer to the response to GMI 4(b).

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario Interrogatory #4**

- Reference:** TCPL Supplemental Evidence, page 5, lines 26-37
- Preamble:** What are the alternatives to the proposed facilities? Are any alternatives to the proposed facilities preferable to the proposed facilities?
- Request:** In providing these figures, has TCPL assumed as a zero pressure drop across the pressure control station connecting segment A to Albion?
- a. Does TCPL operate any "zero pressure drop pressure" control stations in its system (compression stations excluded)?
 - b. Is it then true that "To arrive at Albion with a higher than required distribution pressure as suggested by Enbridge is overbuilding...."?
 - c. Please provide the calculation that supports the NPS 24 alternative that TCPL is recommending.

Response:

- a) TransCanada does not currently operate any "zero pressure drop pressure" control stations. Pressure loss across a pressure control station depends on the design of the station and the required pressure loss. TransCanada typically assumes the design of a pressure control station would result in a 35 kPa loss. When a 35 kPa loss is simulated in the Segment A sizing analysis, the capacity of the NPS 24 drops from 950 TJ/d to 940 TJ/d. This capacity is still more than sufficient to meet Enbridge's requirements of 800 TJ/d.
- b) Yes. Arriving at Albion at a pressure higher than required is an indication that Segment A is overbuilt. The overbuild could be corrected by reducing Enbridge's pipe size selection or reducing or eliminating compression at Union's Parkway West site.
- c) Calculations for the design of the NPS 24 alternative were determined using a pipeline modeling software called SynerGEE Gas (Version 4.70). All assumptions and inputs for the modeling can be found in the response to EGD 1(a).

**TransCanada PipeLines Limited Response to
Federation of Rental-Housing Providers of Ontario Interrogatory #5**

- Reference:** TCPL Supplemental Evidence, page 17
- Preamble:** Is the proposed timing of the various components of the projects appropriate?
- Request:** Please provide any analysis of Ontario impacts TCPL performed prior to entering into the MOU with EGD.
- a. Please provide any analysis of Ontario impacts presented to TCPL's Board of Directors prior to the decision to notify Union and Gaz Metro that additional capacity between Parkway and Maple would not be available as of Nov. 1, 2015.
 - b. Please provide the analysis that was presented to TCPL's Board of Directors which lead to the Union/Gaz Metro notification referenced above.

Response:

TransCanada did not perform an analysis of Ontario impacts prior to entering into the MOU. TransCanada conducted an analysis on the impacts to its system as a whole.

- a) TransCanada did not provide an analysis of Ontario impacts to its Board of Directors prior to notifying Union and Gaz Métro that capacity between Parkway and Maple would not be available as of November 1, 2015. Please refer to the response to Energy Probe 11 for a description of the potential impacts to Ontario customers.
- b) Please refer to the response to Union 4(c) from the first round of IRs.