



Fogler, Rubinoff LLP
Lawyers

77 King Street West
Suite 3000, PO Box 95
TD Centre North Tower
Toronto, ON M5K 1G8
t: 416.864.9700 | f: 416.941.8852
foglers.com

June 8, 2015

Reply To: Thomas Brett
Direct Dial: 416.941.8861
E-mail: tbrett@foglers.com
Our File No. 152834

VIA RESS, EMAIL AND COURIER

Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2701
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

Attention: Kirsten Walli,
Board Secretary

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Board File No. EB-2015-0010

Please find attached the Interrogatories of BOMA, in the above noted proceeding.

Two hard copies will be delivered via courier to the Board.

Yours truly,

FOGLER, RUBINOFF LLP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Tom Brett", written over the printed name.

Thomas Brett

TB/dd

Encls.

cc: All Parties (*via email*)

IN THE MATTER OF the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15 (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Union Gas Limited for an order or orders clearing certain noncommodity related deferral accounts and sharing utility earnings pursuant to a Board-approved earnings sharing mechanism.

**INTERROGATORIES OF THE
BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,
GREATER TORONTO ("BOMA")**

Interrogatory #1

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Pages 2-3

When does Union set the February 28 inventory checkpoint balances for DP customers? On what date was it set in 2015? Please provide copy of Union's letter of February 23, 2015 to customers.

Interrogatory #2

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Pages 3-4

Please provide the details of the associated infrastructure costs of \$19.906 million, referred to in Table 10, Line 2, Column (b).

Interrogatory #3

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Page 3, Schedule 1, Lines 1 and 6

Please explain more fully why the \$17.010 million is shown as a reduction in both "gas sales" and "cost of gas".

Interrogatory #4

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 3, Page 2 and Exhibit A, Tab 1, Page 6, Table 1

Why is a portion of the amounts collected from DP customers who had negative gas balances not credited to the DP customers that had positive DP balances for the period until March 31, 2015? Please discuss fully.

Interrogatory #5

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 4, Page 4

The receipt point is listed as Alliance Pipeline LP interconnect (Joliet). Does this mean that the gas is being transported to Joliet from Alberta by Alliance? Please explain fully.

Interrogatory #6

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 4, Page 11

What are the particulars of the renewal rights on the:

- SSMDA contract with TCPL?
- contract with TCPL for Union's NDA?

- Assignment of 8,000 GJ of capacity on September 11, 2014?

Interrogatory #7

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 4, Appendix A

- (a) Please explain for each of Schedule 1, Schedule 2, Schedule 3, what the three analyses are designed to show. Please account for the widely varying Assumption used in Developing Transportation Contracting Analysis for each of the three Schedules, for example, to Henry Hub prices in each of the years in each of the three Schedules. Please account for each of the variances in the three Schedules.
- (b) Provide a similar explanation for Schedule 4, Scenario Analysis. What is it trying to show; why were the particular routes chosen and comparisons made?
- (c) Please explain the composition supply cost at TCPL Niagara, for each of the three scenarios, and each of the other components of the Landed Cost for each of the three scenarios.

Interrogatory #8

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 5, Page 13 et al

Please explain why Union has not made larger commitments to purchase gas at Niagara for the Marcellus Shale beyond the 2012 commitment of about 21,000 GJ/day. Please compare prices with proposed delivery to Dawn from Marcellus and Utica Shale, with deliveries to Niagara/Chippewa from Marcellus/Utica Shale. Please discuss fully.

Interrogatory #9

Ref: Ibid, Page 23, Figure 9

For which of returnees to sales service from BT, General Service-unbundled and General Service-ABC does Union require additional transportation capacity? Please explain fully.