

VIA E-MAIL

May 15, 2017

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

RE: EB-2017-0306 – EDG/Union Merger – J3.5 Impact of Rebasing - Clarification

We are writing on behalf of FRPO out of concern for the evolution of our undertaking request of Union Gas to understand the potential impact of rebasing on the Dawn-Parkway system. Our reading of Union Gas' consideration of our request that was provided after the Monday lunch break unduly narrows our request to the impact of the PDO.

Our specific request was to estimate the impact of rebasing on the Dawn-Parkway system at the margin (May 15 Transcript, Page 27, lines 21-24). We had focused in lead up to the request on the addition of assets and capacities, the costs of which were included in rates. While we understand Union's focus on the PDO as we have been using J2.5 as a tool, we were asking more broadly about rebasing based upon the assets included in rates at the end of 2018 (Tr. Page 26, lines 25-28).

The fact that we were seeking a broader impact of rebasing is emphasized in that depreciation of the Dawn-Parkway assets that were in rate base at the outset of the IRM period ought to be considered also (Tr. Page 30, line 16 to Page 31, line 14). However, in being limited in time, we did not get to pages 8 and 9 of our supplemental compendium, K3.1, that show that while the costs of the assets were put into rates, the billing units associated with those capacity increases were not. If one were to look at the impact of rebasing at the margin at the end of 2018, it would be clear that the billing units would require adjustment also.

Putting the high-level factors together, we are seeking an analysis at the margin from initial 2013 rates at the start of rebasing until 2018 that estimates the percentage impact of Dawn-Parkway changes on in-franchise and M12 rates by looking at the percentage changes in rate base and billing units:

- Rate base associated with Dawn-Parkway capacity, net of depreciation, increased X%
- Billing units including in-franchise needs and ex-franchise needs, increased Y₁% and Y₂%
- Provide specific delineation of the treatment of PDO costs and surplus capacity costs

By looking at macro percentage changes, we respectfully submit that this undertaking could be performed to provide the Board with an estimate of the percentage impact on Dawn-Parkway rates for Enbridge (as an M12 customer) and Union's in-franchise customers.

We trust this letter provides a better understanding of our request and ask Board staff counsel to bring this letter to the attention of the panel for their understanding and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of FRPO,



Dwayne R. Quinn
Principal
DR QUINN & ASSOCIATES LTD.

- c. Andrew Mandyam, EGD, M. Kitchen - Union Gas,
EGDRegulatoryProceedings, UnionRegulatoryProceedings
Parties to EB-2017-0306

1 MR. QUINN: It's in the rate-setting mechanism and the
2 deferred rebasing period. Our premise here is there is
3 excess capacity that the customers have.

4 MS. SPOEL: Well, that's fine. I don't need to hear
5 your argument now --

6 MR. QUINN: Okay.

7 MS. SPOEL: -- I just want to understand why it was --
8 where this all fits into the picture. Now I understand, so
9 thank you.

10 MR. KITCHEN: I just wanted to pick up on one thing
11 that Mr. Quinn said, that if we defer rebasing, these will
12 stay in rates for the term of the rebasing period. If we
13 were to rebase, they would be built into rates through cost
14 allocation.

15 MR. QUINN: Well, we would like to see what that would
16 look like, so since you've led that, Mr. Kitchen, what
17 would the impact be? Can you take an undertaking to
18 demonstrate what you believe the impact would be and how
19 you would allocate those costs, including the 106 of excess
20 capacity that's demonstrated in 2017 and '18?

21 MR. CASS: Well, my concern, Madam Chair, is Mr. Quinn
22 is now asking for really a cost study that would be done if
23 there was a rebasing. Of course the applicant's proposal
24 is that there be a deferral of rebasing.

25 MR. QUINN: And Mr. Cass, to be clear, I'm just asking
26 for what the impact would be on the Dawn-Parkway system if
27 Union were to rebase, based upon the assets that are in
28 place in -- at the end of 2018.

1 [Witness panel confers]

2 MR. KITCHEN: Mr. Quinn, I am not even sure that's
3 doable without doing a full cost study, because it requires
4 us to -- you can't just look at this one piece of the Dawn-
5 Parkway system. You have to rebalance everything, and I'm
6 just, I'm not sure how we could do it without doing a full
7 cost study.

8 Second, what should happen, right, is that the costs
9 that show up in column E at line 17 would simply be
10 allocated to in-franchise rate classes because the in-
11 franchise demands, distance-weighted demands, on the Dawn-
12 Trafalgar system would increase for in-franchise rate
13 classes, and they would decrease for others. So I'm just
14 not sure how we could do this.

15 MS. ANDERSON: So Mr. Kitchen, is there something that
16 you can provide on this matter that doesn't require a full
17 cost study?

18 MR. KITCHEN: I'll offer this: What we'll do is at
19 lunch we can sit and talk and see what we can provide.

20 MS. ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

21 MR. QUINN: If I may, Madam Chair, I'm going to ask
22 Mr. Kitchen, we're interested in the impact at the margin.
23 Not a full cost study, just what the impact would be at the
24 margin; is that doable?

25 MR. KITCHEN: That's what we're going to talk about at
26 lunch.

27 MR. QUINN: Can we have an undertaking to ensure that
28 we can at least have a response?

1 during the four-year period?

2 MR. REDFORD: That's correct, that would have been --
3 it would have been an IR back from EB-2017-0087.

4 MR. QUINN: It's in my compendium on page 11, yes.

5 So Union was able to have no interruptions and
6 sell millions of dollars worth of Dawn-Parkway capacity
7 during the years of the IRM period, correct?

8 MR. REDFORD: Well, again, you know, we would sell
9 capacity available on the day in our system, which would
10 not just include any excess capacity, but would include
11 capacity that was not nominated by firm customers at the
12 timely window.

13 So to the extent that people aren't using their
14 capacity, then we would look to sell it out into the
15 market.

16 MR. QUINN: Okay. So I don't know that we need to go
17 through the specific numbers, so I'm going to jump to -- so
18 you've added approximately 20 percent capacity since the
19 initiation of the PDO shift, and that has gone into rates
20 through the capital pass-through, correct?

21 MR. KITCHEN: That's correct.

22 MR. QUINN: And the original costs that are in base
23 rates have not been depreciated over the period, correct?

24 MR. KITCHEN: We are under a price cap, so we apply
25 the price cap to the base.

26 MR. QUINN: Okay. So as you're considering the
27 undertaking, we would like to understand again what that
28 impact would be of rebasing, including the depreciation

1 that would be seen at that time. So I am just trying to
2 give you that context for the benefit of your
3 consideration.

4 MR. KITCHEN: I think you'll have to explain this a
5 little bit better for me.

6 MR. QUINN: The original assets, the 6,800 tJs that
7 were in base rates, have not been depreciated over the
8 five-year period?

9 MR. KITCHEN: That's correct.

10 MR. QUINN: They would be depreciated if you were to
11 do a rebasing. That would have a material impact on your
12 results, so I'm just trying to make sure that's not
13 forgotten in your consideration would be what the impact
14 would be on rebasing.

15 MR. KITCHEN: I think that's one of my challenges in
16 trying to do this cost allocation study that you want us to
17 do for this particular case. It's not a simple matter.

18 But as I've said, we will undertake to provide --
19 we'll discuss it and see what we can do.

20 MS. ANDERSON: Mr. Quinn, I do need to check in on
21 timing, just to make sure everyone is clear. The hearing
22 plan I have in front of me had you at 30 minutes today,
23 because you had the 20 minutes the last time.

24 MR. QUINN: Madam Chair, I had 90 minutes in my
25 original request; it was cut down to 60 minutes. I've
26 actually worked a fair amount trying to tighten this up
27 over the weekend. Unfortunately, with the addition of
28 J2.5, it gave me a vehicle. But there is information