

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

Barristers and Solicitors

David Stevens
Direct: 416.865.7783
E-mail: dstevens@airdberlis.com

February 23, 2015

BY EMAIL AND FILED VIA RESS

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli:

**Re: EB-2014-0276: Enbridge Gas Distribution
2015 Rate Adjustment**

We represent Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. (Enbridge, or the Company).

According to Procedural Order No. 2, any parties wishing the Technical Conference in this case to proceed were to have filed a letter to that effect with the Board by noon today. Enbridge has received letters from Board Staff, VECC, FRPO and CME.

In its letter, Board Staff expressed its view that a Technical Conference is not necessary, but, in the event the Board sees any need for additional evidence, Board Staff proposed a process for written questions and answers that can be accommodated within the "existing case timing". VECC supported the suggestion made by Board Staff and indicated that, since it is still analyzing the responses to interrogatories, the time to put in writing any additional requests for clarification of matters would be helpful.

Only FRPO and CME put forward topic areas for a Technical Conference. FRPO's questions relate to only one topic area (gas supply). CME lists a broader range of topics (but gives few details about actual subject areas). It appears that CME proposes to continue to pursue, at a Technical Conference, its questions about Enbridge's performance in 2014. In response to interrogatories such as CME Interrogatories #4 and 5, Enbridge made clear its position that questions about its performance in 2014 are not relevant to this proceeding and that a review of 2014 actual results opposite 2014 Board-Approved is to occur in the context of a 2014 Earnings Sharing Mechanism application in the spring of 2015.

In Enbridge's view, it will not be a productive or useful exercise to proceed with a Technical Conference at which Enbridge will reiterate its position that CME's questions about performance in 2014 are not relevant.

Enbridge agrees with the comments made by VECC to the effect that the written process proposed by Board Staff is an appropriate means of addressing further requests for clarification of the evidence in this case. As well, VECC stated that, in its experience, applicants will make best efforts to deal with reasonable requests to clarify matters in advance of a settlement conference; Enbridge confirms that its practice has been, and in this case will be, in accordance with VECC's experience.

Regardless of the procedure adopted for further questions and answers, Enbridge will object to answering CME's questions about 2014 performance that, in Enbridge's view, are not relevant. Otherwise, Enbridge confirms its expectation that, if the Board adopts the procedure suggested by Board Staff, Enbridge can and will respond effectively and efficiently to relevant questions in the proposed topic areas.

Yours very truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP



David Stevens

cc. Enbridge Gas Distribution
All parties registered in EB-2012-0459

21851787.1