

montréal • ottawa • toronto • hamilton • waterloo region • calgary • vancouver • beijing • moscow • london

July 7, 2014

VIA RESS AND COURIER

Ms. Kirsten Walli ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD P.O. Box 2319, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor 2300 Yonge Street Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4 Ian A. Mondrow Direct: 416-369-4670 ian.mondrow@gowlings.com

Assistant: Cathy Galler Direct: 416-369-4570 cathy.galler@gowlings.com

Dear Ms. Walli:

## Re: EB-2013-0365 – Union Gas Limited (Union) 2014 Rates Application.

Industrial Gas Users Association (IGUA) Argument – Clarification of IGUA's Position.

On July 4<sup>th</sup> Union filed its Reply Argument in the captioned proceeding. In its Reply Union asserts<sup>1</sup> that IGUA *"support[s] Union's position"* in respect of the Learnington Line Project issue. Union states its position at paragraph 19 of its Reply as follows:

"[Union's] contracting practices were appropriate, consistent with the approach taken by Union in connection with other distribution facility expansions and the Board's E.B.O. 188 Guidelines."

In respect of Union's contracting practices for the Learnington Line Project, IGUA in its June 24<sup>th</sup> Argument specifically stated [emphasis added]:

IGUA takes <u>no position</u> on the equity of the <u>particular contracting activities engaged in by</u> <u>Union in respect of the Learnington line</u>. The testimony provided by Union's witnesses on this topic does, however, raise a number of concerns for IGUA.

In respect of the consistency of Union's contracting for the Learnington line with Union's contracting for other distribution facility expansions, IGUA specifically stated:

.... Union's evidence is that, historically, this practice of contracting in support of the revenue forecast underpinning an expansion has been limited to an individual customer. In the case of the Learnington expansion Union extended this practice to a collection of customers. This fact raises some question about when the application of such practices

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Union Reply Argument, paragraph 20.



is appropriate, and underscores the need for better definition of the intent and execution of such practices.

IGUA's June 24<sup>th</sup> Argument recommended further consideration by the Board of Union's system expansion related contracting practices.

In light of Union's characterization of IGUA's position we felt it important provide this clarification.

Yours truly,

malrou

Ian A. Mondrow

c. C. Ripley (Union) C. Smith (Torys) S. Rahbar (IGUA) K. Viraney (Board Staff) Intervenors of Record

TOR\_LAW\ 8473425\1