

INTERROGATORIES FOR UNION GAS LIMITED
FROM THE CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA

EB-2013-0365 – 2014 RATES

1. (Exhibit A/Tab 4/p. 3) The evidence indicates that large volume direct purchase customers have requested that Union eliminate the Parkway obligation because the gas supply cost to direct purchase customers to maintain the obligation exceeds the delivery rate benefit of the obligation. Please provide an illustrative example of the impact of the obligation on a large volume direct purchase customer. Please show the bill impacts on a large volume customer with and without the obligation.
2. (Exhibit A/Tab 1/p. 11) The evidence indicates that for residential consumers in the North the annual rate decrease is between \$16.54 and \$19.76 per year. For most residential consumers in the South the annual rate increase is approximately \$1.55 per year. Please explain what specific factors account for these differentials between the North and the South.
3. (Exhibit A/Tab 4/p. 4) Please explain how, if at all, Union's proposed new facilities that were the subject of the LTC proceeding with Enbridge Gas Distribution could impact Union's proposal with respect to the elimination of the Parkway Delivery Obligation. If the Board does not approve the facilities is the proposal impacted in any way?
4. (Exhibit A/Tab 4/p. 4) The evidence states that effective January 1, 2019, the reduction in the Parkway obligated deliveries and M12 demands results in an increase of costs of approximately \$15.4 million. In addition, the evidence states that the expected delivery rate increase for in-franchise rate classes associated with this reduction in the Parkway Obligation is approximately \$8.5 to \$9 million. Please explain the relationship between these two numbers. For each year, 2014-2019, please set out the delivery rate impacts for each rate class associated with the elimination of the obligation.
5. (Exhibit A/Tab 4/p. 20) The evidence states that after receiving feedback from the POWG, Union revised its proposal. Please explain what "feedback" was received and the rationale for revising the proposal.