



EB-2014-0182

Union Gas Limited

**Application for leave to construct a natural gas pipelines
and ancillary facilities in the Town of Milton and the
Town of Oakville and for approval to recover the cost
consequences of the development of the proposed
Burlington Oakville Project.**

BEFORE: Emad Elsayed
Presiding Member

Christine Long
Member

**DECISION ON ISSUES LIST
March 10, 2015**

Union Gas Limited (Union) filed an application with the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) on December 12, 2014 for:

1. leave to construct 12 kilometres of NPS 20 pipeline from the Parkway West Station to Union's existing Bronte Gate Station located east of Ninth Line and south of Dundas Street East in the Town of Oakville pursuant to section 90 of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15, Schedule B (Act);
2. approval of the recovery of costs associated with the system expansion which is the subject of this application pursuant to section 36 of the Act; and

3. approval of an accounting order to establish the Burlington Oakville Deferral Account which is the subject of this application pursuant to section 36 of the Act.

A Notice was issued on January 13, 2015 and was served and published as directed.

The OEB issued Procedural Order No. 1 on February 19, 2015 to, among other things, invite comments on the Draft Issues List and set the schedule for a written discovery process.

Comments on the Draft Issues List

Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (VECC) and Union filed comments on the Draft Issues List.

With respect to Issue No. 3, Union suggested that there is no need to distinguish between long-term and short-term rate impacts. Union proposed that Issue No. 3 be changed to the following:

3. *What are the potential rate impacts to customers? Are the rate impacts appropriate?*

VECC agreed with the Draft Issues List and with Union's suggested wording for Issue No. 3.

Board Findings

The OEB finds that Union's proposed wording for Issue No. 3 is general enough to encompass a broader interpretation and rate impacts including short-term and long-term rate impacts and costs impacts on Union's customers. Therefore, the OEB accepts the wording for Issue No. 3 as proposed by Union and supported by VECC. There is no other change to the Draft Issues List.

THE BOARD ORDERS THAT:

1. The Final Issues List for the proceeding is attached as Appendix A.

All filings to the Board must quote the file number EB-2014-0182 and be made electronically through the Board's web portal at www.pes.ontarioenergyboard.ca/eservice/ in searchable / unrestricted PDF format. Two paper copies must also be filed at the Board's address provided below. Filings must clearly state the sender's name, postal address and telephone number, fax number and e-mail address. Parties must use the document naming conventions and document submission standards outlined in the RESS Document Guideline found at www.ontarioenergyboard.ca/OEB/Industry. If the web portal is not available parties may email their documents to the address below. Those who do not have internet access are required to submit all filings on a CD in PDF format, along with two paper copies. Those who do not have computer access are required to file 7 paper copies.

All communications should be directed to the attention of the Board Secretary at the address below, and be received no later than 4:45 p.m. on the required date.

ADDRESS

Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Attention: Board Secretary
E-mail: boardsec@ontarioenergyboard.ca
Tel: 1-888-632-6273 (Toll free)
Fax: 416-440-7656

DATED at Toronto, March 10, 2015

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Original signed by

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary

Appendix A

FINAL ISSUES LIST

1. Are the proposed facilities needed?
2. Do the proposed facilities meet the Board's economic tests as outlined in the Filing Guidelines on the Economic Tests for Transmission Pipeline Applications, dated February 21, 2013, as applicable?
3. What are the potential rate impacts to customers? Are the rate impacts appropriate?
4. What are the facilities and non-facilities alternatives to the proposed facilities? Have these alternatives been adequately assessed and are any preferable to the proposed facilities, in whole or in part?
5. Do the facilities address the OEB Environmental Guidelines for Hydrocarbon Pipelines as applicable?
6. Are there any outstanding landowner matters for the proposed facilities with respect to routing and construction matters? For greater clarity, landowners include parties from whom permits, crossing agreements and other approvals are required.
7. Is the form of easement agreement offered by Union or that will be offered by Union to each owner of land affected by the approved route or location appropriate?
8. Are the proposed facilities designed in accordance with current technical and safety requirements?
9. Has there been adequate consultation with other potentially affected parties?
10. Does the project meet the capital pass-through mechanism criteria for pre-approval to recover the cost consequences of the proposed facilities?
11. If the Board approves the proposed facilities, what conditions, if any, are appropriate?