578 McNaughton Ave. West Chatham, Ontario, N7L 4J6 Phone: (519) 351-8624

E-mail: randy.aiken@sympatico.ca

October 27, 2015

Ms. Kirsten Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board P.O. Box 2319 2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli,

RE: EB-2015-0116 - Interrogatories of London Property Management Association

Please find attached the interrogatories of the London Property Management Association for Union Gas in the above noted application.

Sincerely,

Randy Aiken

Randy Aiken Aiken & Associates

Encl.

cc: Chris Ripley, Union Gas Limited (e-mail)

Union Gas Limited

Application for natural gas distribution, transmission and storage rates effective January 1, 2016

INTERROGATORIES OF LONDON PROPERTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

LPMA.1

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, page 6

When does Union expect the 2014 DSM audit process will be completed? If the audit is completed prior to the completion of this application, will Union update the 2016 volumes based on the 2014 audited volumes?

LPMA.2

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, page 6

- a) Please explain how Union has identified the customers in rate M7 where the LRAM results are being transferred back to the M4 and M5A rate classes.
- b) Please explain how Union has identified the DSM savings attributable to these identified customers.
- c) Please explain how reducing the M4 and M5A volumes for DSM savings that occurred in 2014 for customers that are in rate M7 in 2016 impacts the volumes for rates M4 and M5A in 2016.

LPMA.3

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, page 27

If the 2011 DSM audited contract rate LRAM numbers were available June 29, 2012, why were the impacts not included in either the 2014 or 2015 rates?

LPMA.4

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, Table 1

Please provide a version of the "Detail Change in Revenue" section of Table 1 that provides the same breakdown of the \$60,419 increase as shown in lines 4 through 8, but does so at the rate class level.

LPMA.5

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, pages 13-14

Please explain why Union is proposing to adjust the 2016 customer-related cost variance over all the delivery volumes within each of the M1 and 01 rate classes by amounts that are different by block. Does Union's proposal reflect the same proportional reduction in each of the delivery block charges instead of the same absolute reduction by block?

LPMA.6

Ref: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Updated, pages 15-16

- a) For each of the two previous winters, please provide the number of customers that did not comply with the interruption in each of Union North and Union South and by rate class.
- b) Please provide the amount of gas consumed by rate class that was in excess of the firm contract parameters for each of the previous two winters.
- c) For each of the two previous winters, please provide the number of customers that did comply with the interruption in each of Union North and Union South by rate class.