



**Bonnie Jean Adams** tel 416-495-5499  
Regulatory Coordinator fax 416-495-6072  
Regulatory Affairs EGDRegulatoryProceedings@enbridge.com

**Enbridge Gas Distribution**  
500 Consumers Road  
North York, Ontario M2J 1P8  
Canada

August 31, 2015

**VIA RESS, EMAIL and COURIER**

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

Dear Ms. Walli,

**Re: Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. (the “Company” or “Enbridge”)  
Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) File: EB-2015-0049  
Multi-Year Demand Side Management Plan (2015 to 2020)  
Undertaking Responses**

---

Enclosed please find the following undertaking responses:

- Exhibit J5.51 and J5.5B;
- Exhibit J6.1, J6.4 and J6.7;
- Exhibit J7.2; and
- Exhibit J8.10

The submission has been filed through the Board’s Regulatory Electronic Submission System (“RESS”) and will be available on the Company’s website under the “Other Regulatory Proceedings” tab at [www.enbridgegas.com/ratecase](http://www.enbridgegas.com/ratecase).

If you require further information, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

(Original Signed)

Bonnie Jean Adams  
Regulatory Coordinator

cc: Mr. Dennis O’Leary, Aird & Berlis  
EB-2015-0049 Intervenors

UNDERTAKING J5.1

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 35

Enbridge to provide a TRC net benefit number for 2015.

RESPONSE

The 2015 TRC net benefit number, inclusive of the 15% adder for societal benefits, totals \$193,867,045.

Witnesses: K. Mark  
F. Oliver-Glasford  
B. Ott

UNDERTAKING J5.5B

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 110

To look at the impact of the change in HEC participation from '15 to '16 and what that generates in terms of a value for CCM.

RESPONSE

Reference: EB-2012-0394 Exhibit B Tab 1 Schedule 4  
Exhibit I.T2.EGDI.STAFF.7

Please see in the table below the cumulative cubic metre ("CCM") savings contributions from the HEC program, toward the Resource Acquisition CCM targets for the years 2015 and 2016.

	<b>2015 Contribution to CCM Target (as filed)</b>	<b>2016 Contribution to CCM Target (as filed)</b>
<b>Home Energy Conservation (HEC)</b>	11,964,613	102,622,499

Witnesses: M. Lister  
F. Oliver-Glasford  
B. Ott

UNDERTAKING J6.1

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 45

Enbridge to advise of the amounts to pay in the current period, the 2016 to 2020 period, from past commitments, how much of that was budgeted but not spent in prior years.

RESPONSE

Below, please find the unspent budgets for Residential and Commercial Savings by Design between 2012 and 2014. The 2012 and 2013 values have been approved by the Board following Clearance of Accounts proceedings, while the 2014 value remains subject this approval process.

It is important to note that the multi-year design of the program and the establishment of targets and budgets were the product of Settlement Agreements with Stakeholders for both 2012 and 2013/2014.

<b>Residential Savings by Design</b>			
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>
2012	\$ 895,000.00	\$ 832,409.00	\$ 62,591.00
2013	\$ 2,305,000.00	\$ 1,029,535.00	\$ 1,275,465.00
2014	\$ 2,445,000.00	\$ 1,334,035.00	\$ 1,110,965.00
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 2,449,021.00</b>
<b>Commercial Savings by Design</b>			
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Variance</b>
2012	\$ 775,000.00	\$ 855,398.00	\$ (80,398.00)
2013	\$ 590,000.00	\$ 590,592.00	\$ (592.00)
2014	\$ 950,000.00	\$ 739,435.00	\$ 210,565.00
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 129,575.00</b>

Witnesses: S. Bertuzzi  
 M. Lister

Additional information on forecasted spending and incentives for both Savings by Design offerings is available in Enbridge's interrogatory response Exhibit I.T5.EGDI.SEC.12 and at Technical Conference Undertaking JT1.38.

Witnesses: S. Bertuzzi  
M. Lister

UNDERTAKING J6.4

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 61

Enbridge to provide its current outlook for cost and rate allocation

RESPONSE

Upon review of the transcripts Enbridge interprets this undertaking to be requesting a best estimate of 2015 rate allocation, with two variables pre-determined. The two variables held constant are the assumption that the entire DSMVA overspend of 15% is used and the maximum shareholder incentive amount is claimed. Under these two conditions, and acknowledging that the rate allocation itself is a forecast, the Company has produced a rate allocation scenario below.

<b>2015 DSM Budget</b> <b>Forecasted Rate Allocation Assuming Full 15% Overspend, Full 2015</b> <b>Incremental Budget Use, and Maximum Shareholder Incentive</b> <b>(\$ millions)</b>					
Rate Class	DSM Budget + 15% DSMVA Overspend	2015 Incremental Budget	Total Available DSM Budget	Shareholder Incentive @ 150% Target	Total Possible Allocation
Rate 1	\$22.12	\$3.63	<b>\$25.75</b>	\$5.25	\$31.00
Rate 6	\$13.23	\$1.06	<b>\$14.29</b>	\$4.91	\$19.20
Rate 9	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
Rate 110	\$0.76	\$0.07	<b>\$0.83</b>	\$0.30	\$1.13
Rate 115	\$0.73	\$0.07	<b>\$0.80</b>	\$0.30	\$1.10
Rate 125	\$0.08	\$0.00	<b>\$0.08</b>	\$0.02	\$0.10
Rate 135	\$0.18	\$0.02	<b>\$0.20</b>	\$0.07	\$0.27
Rate 145	\$0.31	\$0.03	<b>\$0.33</b>	\$0.12	\$0.45
Rate 170	\$0.30	\$0.03	<b>\$0.33</b>	\$0.12	\$0.44
Rate 200	\$0.02	\$0.00	<b>\$0.02</b>	\$0.01	\$0.03
Rate 300	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>\$0.00</b>	\$0.00	\$0.01
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$37.72</b>	<b>\$4.92</b>	<b>\$42.64</b>	<b>\$11.09</b>	<b>\$53.73</b>

Witnesses: K. Mark  
 F. Oliver-Glasford  
 B. Ott

Under this scenario and the above allocations the average monthly bill impact of 2015 DSM to a typical residential customer would be \$1.33. Please note that while Enbridge has provided the above analysis in order to be responsive, the Company is not forecasting to achieve its maximum shareholder incentive in 2015.

Witnesses: K. Mark  
F. Oliver-Glasford  
B. Ott

UNDERTAKING J6.6

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 98

Enbridge to provide, with respect to the five programs, a rough notion of what percentage of the budget they constitute

RESPONSE

Please find below a table that represents the percentage of annual budget and associated CCM savings, over the six year multi-year plan, that the School Energy Competition, Run it Right ("RiR"), Comprehensive Energy Management ("CEM"), My Home Health Record, and the Commercial and Industrial Behavior offer constitute. Please note that the Company has not proposed a budget or target associated with the Small Commercial and Industrial Behaviour offer. As indicated in the evidence at Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, it is envisioned that a pilot program would be conducted for the 2016-2017 heating season. Enbridge anticipates the results of the pilot program will be available for further consideration in time for the mid-term review, including, if appropriate, any consideration for budget or target proposals.

Witnesses: P. Goldman  
R. Kennedy  
M. Lister



Budget Summary					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
School Competition	\$ 302,197	\$ 600,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 510,000	\$ 520,200
RiR	\$ 1,510,985	\$ 1,720,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 1,941,182	\$ 1,983,188
CEM	\$ 513,735	\$ 844,045	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 1,040,400
My Home Health Record	\$ 3,913,434	\$ 6,910,000	\$ 6,910,000	\$ 7,059,774	\$ 7,212,543
Commercial & Industrial Behavior	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$ 51,235,727</b>	<b>\$ 60,626,882</b>	<b>\$ 66,300,131</b>	<b>\$ 67,626,133</b>	<b>\$ 68,978,656</b>
Budget Percentage					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
School Competition	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
RiR	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
CEM	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%
My Home Health Record	8%	11%	10%	10%	10%
Commercial & Industrial Behavior	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CCM Summary (millions)					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
School Competition	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RiR	2	2.56	2.66	2.75	2.78
CEM	0.32	0.4	0.45	0.424	0.45
My Home Health Record	19.5	25	19.8	18	14.3
Commercial & Industrial Behavior	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total CCM</b>	<b>1001.74</b>	<b>1083.06</b>	<b>1147.9</b>	<b>1165.77</b>	<b>1182.3</b>
CCM Percentage (millions)					
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
School Competition	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RiR	0.20%	0.24%	0.23%	0.24%	0.24%
CEM	0.03%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%
My Home Health Record	1.95%	2.31%	1.72%	1.54%	1.21%
Commercial & Industrial Behavior	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Witnesses: P. Goldman  
 R. Kennedy  
 M. Lister

UNDERTAKING J7.2

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 138

Enbridge to provide the basis differential between Dawn and Henry Hub

RESPONSE

The basis differential between Henry Hub and Dawn is provided in the table below based on commodity information sourced from Enbridge's Openlink database for a period of 5 years. Commodity prices are based on a 21 day monthly average settlement price for market close August 10, 2015.

<b>Month</b>	<b>Henry Hub (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Dawn (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Basis (C\$/GJ)</b>
Nov-15	3.65	3.94	0.29
Dec-15	3.85	4.26	0.40
Jan-16	3.99	4.36	0.37
Feb-16	3.98	4.45	0.47
Mar-16	3.93	4.45	0.52
Apr-16	3.74	3.73	0.00
May-16	3.73	3.73	0.00
Jun-16	3.76	3.67	-0.10
Jul-16	3.80	3.57	-0.23
Aug-16	3.81	3.69	-0.12
Sep-16	3.81	3.78	-0.02
Oct-16	3.85	3.85	0.01
Nov-16	3.94	4.06	0.12
Dec-16	4.14	4.31	0.16
Jan-17	4.28	4.44	0.16
Feb-17	4.27	4.42	0.15
Mar-17	4.19	4.37	0.19
Apr-17	3.88	3.66	-0.22
May-17	3.87	3.87	0.00
Jun-17	3.91	3.55	-0.35
Jul-17	3.94	2.93	-1.02
Aug-17	3.96	3.48	-0.48

Witness: A. Welburn

<b>Month</b>	<b>Henry Hub (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Dawn (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Basis (C\$/GJ)</b>
Sep-17	3.94	3.89	-0.05
Oct-17	3.97	3.88	-0.09
Nov-17	4.06	4.06	0.00
Dec-17	4.26	4.25	-0.01
Jan-18	4.41	4.40	-0.01
Feb-18	4.38	4.38	0.00
Mar-18	4.31	4.30	-0.01
Apr-18	3.92	3.65	-0.27
May-18	3.92	3.92	0.00
Jun-18	3.96	3.58	-0.38
Jul-18	4.00	2.89	-1.11
Aug-18	4.01	3.50	-0.51
Sep-18	4.00	3.95	-0.05
Oct-18	4.02	3.90	-0.12
Nov-18	4.11	4.13	0.02
Dec-18	4.31	4.32	0.01
Jan-19	4.46	4.47	0.01
Feb-19	4.43	4.45	0.02
Mar-19	4.36	4.37	0.01
Apr-19	3.99	3.69	-0.30
May-19	3.99	3.98	0.00
Jun-19	4.02	3.66	-0.36
Jul-19	4.06	2.96	-1.10
Aug-19	4.08	3.58	-0.50
Sep-19	4.07	4.03	-0.04
Oct-19	4.10	3.96	-0.14
Nov-19	4.19	4.21	0.02
Dec-19	4.41	4.42	0.01
Jan-20	4.57	4.58	0.01
Feb-20	4.54	4.56	0.02
Mar-20	4.47	4.48	0.01
Apr-20	4.11	3.90	-0.20
May-20	4.11	4.10	0.00
Jun-20	4.14	3.89	-0.25
Jul-20	4.17	3.42	-0.76
Aug-20	4.20	3.86	-0.34
Sep-20	4.19	4.16	-0.03

Witness: A. Welburn

<b>Month</b>	<b>Henry Hub (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Dawn (C\$/GJ)</b>	<b>Basis (C\$/GJ)</b>
Oct-20	4.23	4.14	-0.09
Nov-20	4.33	4.30	-0.02
Dec-20	4.55	4.51	-0.04
Jan-21	4.72	4.57	-0.15

Witness: A. Welburn

UNDERTAKING J8.10

UNDERTAKING

TR, page 82

Enbridge to confirm whether low income multi-res and home winterproofing are or are not cost effective in the sense that they would pass a TRC plus test, but they are cost effective in a broader context of the level of cost effectiveness that's required for low income, on a program-by-program basis.

RESPONSE

As per Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 4, Table 1 of Enbridge's pre-filed evidence, the TRC Plus ratio of Enbridge's multi-family low income offer is 1.87. The same reference provides the TRC Plus ratio for the Company's low income single-family offering, home winterproofing, which is 1.20.

Witnesses: E. Lontoc  
K. Mark