

September 24, 2014

VIA EMAIL AND COURIER

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

Attention: Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: EB-2014-0012 Union Gas Limited ("Union") - Hagar Liquefaction Service

This letter is further to the letter of Union's counsel dated September 23, 2014 which responded to my letter dated September 18, 2014 filed on behalf of Northeast Midstream LP ("Northeast").

In its letter, Union challenges the length of time Northeast has requested to deliver its motion material in support of its section 29(1) request. It suggests that Northeast should have a matter of days to file its motion and that a period of less than four weeks as proposed by Northeast causes undue delay. As Union may be aware, Northeast is not an entity which has previously appeared before the Board and has limited resources to address the issues raised by Union's application. Nevertheless, Northeast has incurred substantial costs to date in order to intervene on the application and to determine that a motion under section 29(1) is appropriate in the circumstances. We note that Union's application was delivered on May 16, 2014 while its Executive, in the fourth quarter of 2013, had supported the filing of the application. Since Union had several months to bring its application, Northeast suggests that a few weeks to bring its motion is reasonable.

Most importantly, we note that Union does not object to Northeast's proposal that its section 29(1) motion be dealt with at the outset of, and in conjunction with, Union's application.

The Board and the hearings before it are to address the public interest and not to create polarized and oppositional hearings. Consequently, we support Union's request for adequate time to reply to Northeast's motion. Northeast believes that it might well be possible for Union to prepare its reply after October 15 and prior to the hearing date scheduled for the end of October 2014, but this is obviously a procedural matter for the Board to determine.

We also agree with Union's suggestion that the parties file written submissions in advance of the hearing. We believe that a prudent way to ensure that the written submissions are focused and cover the evidence submitted by the parties is to schedule the filing of written submissions after the evidentiary record is complete.

Finally, Northeast submits that fairness strongly suggests that an oral hearing of Northeast's motion should be held in conjunction with the oral hearing of Union's application.

We look forward to the Board's further direction in this regard.

Yours very truly,



David E. Lederman
DEL/kw

Copy: Charles Keizer, Torys (by e-mail)
Michael Millar, Legal Counsel, Ontario Energy Board (by e-mail)
Intervenors (by e-mail)