

Enbridge Gas Inc.

**Application for 2019 natural gas rates and other charges
effective January 1, 2019**

**DECISION AND PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 4
June 10, 2019**

On August 30, 2018, the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) approved the amalgamation of Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. and Union Gas Limited. In its decision, the OEB also approved a rate-setting framework and associated parameters for the deferred rebasing period of 2019 to 2023.¹ The companies amalgamated effective January 1, 2019, and the new company is called Enbridge Gas Inc.

Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas) filed a complete application with the OEB on December 14, 2018 under section 36(1) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* seeking approval for changes to its natural gas rates effective January 1, 2019. On December 3, 2018, the OEB declared the current rates of Enbridge Gas to be interim effective January 1, 2019 until the OEB issues a final rate order in this matter.

In Decision and Procedural Order No. 2 dated April 1, 2019, the OEB approved an Issues List for the proceeding. The procedural order provided revised timelines for further discovery through interrogatories and a technical conference, and also scheduled a settlement conference. A settlement conference was held on May 13 and 14, 2019. Several issues were settled but a number of significant issues remained unresolved. Enbridge Gas filed a settlement proposal on May 29, 2019.

OEB staff filed a submission on June 3, 2019 supporting the settlement proposal, noting that the settlement was in the public interest and the parties had provided sufficient rationale to corroborate the settlement proposal.

¹ OEB Decision and Order, August 30, 2018, EB-2017-0306 / EB-2017-0307

OEB Findings on Settlement Proposal

The OEB accepts the settlement proposal.

Some of the settled issues are on mechanistic matters, other issues were the result of matters determined in the previous proceedings, and some issues were settled with an agreement to maintain the status quo at this time. The OEB finds this approach acceptable. While discontinuation of variance and deferral accounts is not typically in scope of an incentive rate-setting application, the OEB agrees with the parties that the account balances are zero and no further entries are required.

In accepting this settlement proposal, the OEB notes that parties have accepted the establishment of the Incremental Capital Module (ICM) deferral accounts for the Enbridge Gas Distribution and Union Gas rate zones, and the associated accounting orders. The OEB's decision approving Enbridge Gas' rate setting framework specified that ICM funding was only available for an "in-service capital addition".² While the accounting order does not refer to in-service capital additions, the OEB is satisfied that this is addressed through the calculation of the actual revenue requirement.

Next steps

The OEB has further determined that the unsettled issues will be addressed through a written hearing. The OEB is satisfied that there is sufficient information on the record for parties to proceed with written submissions.

In its cover letter enclosing the settlement proposal, Enbridge Gas advised that the parties agreed on which of the unsettled issues should proceed to an oral hearing, and which should be dealt with in writing. Specifically, the parties proposed that Issues 1, 5(g-l), 7(a), 9, and 10 to 12 (excluding Sudbury) be dealt with by way of an oral hearing. No reasons were provided for this request. The OEB finds this unnecessary for this incentive rate-setting application. The OEB reached this conclusion based on the following:

1. There is no specific relief sought by Enbridge Gas as part of Issue 1 on whether it has responded to all relevant OEB directions from previous proceedings, and parties are free to argue whether certain responses by Enbridge Gas have been inadequate.

² EB-2017-0306/EB-2017-0307 Decision, p. 33

2. The one-time adjustment for capital pass-through (Issue 7(a)) is a matter of argument as to whether Enbridge Gas' request is consistent with the MAADs Decision.³ Issues 5(g-l) are tied to the outcome of the decision on this issue. The OEB concludes that these issues can be dealt with through written submissions.
3. All four ICMs are for projects that have previously been granted leave to construct by the OEB, so the issue of need for the projects has already been adjudicated. Furthermore, any risk related to the in-service date is mitigated by the presence of the ICM deferral accounts agreed to as part of the settlement proposal discussed above. The OEB concludes that Issues 10 to 12 can be dealt with through written submissions, including the approach to the ICM mechanism (e.g. the appropriate price cap index (PCI) and treatment of operating costs).
4. The OEB has already determined that the Utility System Plan and Asset Management Plans are filed to support approval of the ICMs but are not to be approved themselves. It is therefore appropriate for Issue 9 to be heard in writing along with Issues 10 to 12.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ORDERS THAT:

1. The settlement proposal attached as Schedule "A" is approved.
2. The date scheduled for presentation of the settlement proposal is cancelled. The OEB will hold a written hearing on the unsettled issues, as provided below.
3. Enbridge Gas shall file with the OEB its argument-in-chief and serve it on all intervenors by **June 17, 2019**.
4. Intervenors and OEB staff who wish to file final arguments shall file them with the OEB and serve them on other intervenors by **July 4, 2019**.
5. Enbridge Gas shall file their reply argument with the OEB and serve it on all intervenors by **July 12, 2019**.

All filings to the OEB must quote the file number, EB-2018-0305 and be made electronically in searchable/unrestricted PDF format through the OEB's web portal at <https://pes.ontarioenergyboard.ca/eservice/>. Two paper copies must also be filed at the OEB's address provided below. Filings must clearly state the sender's name, postal

³ EB-2017-0306 / EB-2017-0307

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 <http://www.oeb.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 USB memory stick 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. With respect to distribution lists for all electronic correspondence and materials related to this proceeding, parties must include the Case Manager, Khalil Viraney at Khalil.Viraney@oeb.ca and OEB Counsel, Ian Richler at Ian.Richler@oeb.ca.

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, **June 10, 2019**

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Original signed by

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary

SCHEDULE A
ENBRIDGE GAS INC. SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL
ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
EB-2018-0305
JUNE 10, 2019

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

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 Enbridge Gas Inc.,
pursuant to section 36(1) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*,
for an order or orders approving or fixing just and reasonable
rates and other charges for the sale, distribution, transmission
and storage of gas as of January 1, 2019.

SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

May 29, 2019

1. PREAMBLE

This Settlement Proposal (“Proposal”) is filed with the Ontario Energy Board (the “OEB” or “Board”) in its determination, under Docket No. EB-2018-0305, of an application by Enbridge Gas Inc. (“Enbridge Gas”) for an Order or Orders of the Board approving or fixing just and reasonable rates and other charges for the sale, distribution, transmission and storage of natural gas as of January 1, 2019.

As per the Board’s Decision and Procedural Order No. 2, issued April 1, 2019 (“Procedural Order No. 2”), a Settlement Conference was to commence on May 13, 2019 at 9:30 am, and continue May 14, 2019, if necessary in the OEB hearing room at 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, Toronto, Ontario. The Settlement Conference was duly held, with Mr. Ken Rosenberg as facilitator, beginning May 13, 2019 at 9:30 am and ending May 14, 2019 at 2:00 pm, in accordance with the Board’s *Practice Direction on Settlement Conferences* (the “Practice Direction”). This Settlement Proposal arises from the Settlement Conference.

1.1 The Parties

Enbridge Gas and the following intervenors (collectively, the “Parties”) participated in the Settlement Conference:

- Association of Power Producers of Ontario (“APPoO”)
- Building Owners and Managers Association Toronto (“BOMA”)
- Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters (“CME”)
- City of Kitchener (“Kitchener”)

- Consumers Council of Canada (“CCC”)
- Energy Probe Research Foundation (“Energy Probe”)
- Federation of Rental-housing Providers of Ontario (“FRPO”)
- Industrial Gas Users Association (“IGUA”)
- London Property Management Association (“LPMA”)
- Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (“OAPPA”)
- Ontario Greenhouse Vegetable Growers (“OGVG”)
- Ontario Petroleum Institute Inc. (“OPI”)
- Quinte Manufacturers Association (“QMA”)
- School Energy Coalition (“SEC”)
- Six Nations Natural Gas Company Limited (“SNNG”)
- TC Energy
- Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (“VECC”)

Board Staff also participated in the Settlement Conference, but in accordance with the Practice Direction, are not a party to the Settlement Conference. Although Board Staff is not a Party to this Settlement Proposal, the Board Staff who did participate in the Settlement Conference are bound by the same confidentiality standards that apply to the Parties to the proceeding.

1.2 Confidentiality

The Parties acknowledge that this Settlement Conference is confidential in accordance with the Practice Direction on Settlement Agreements. The Parties understand that confidentiality in that context does not have the same meaning as confidentiality in the OEB's *Practice Direction on Confidential Filings*, and the rules of that latter document do not apply. Instead, in this Settlement Conference, and in this Settlement Proposal, the Parties have interpreted "confidential" to mean that the documents and other information provided during the course of the Settlement Conference, the discussion of each issue, the offers and counter-offers, and the negotiations leading to the settlement – or not – of each issue during the Settlement Conference are strictly privileged and without prejudice. None of the foregoing is admissible as evidence in this proceeding, or otherwise, with one exception: the need to resolve a subsequent dispute over the interpretation of any provision of this Settlement Proposal. Further, the Parties shall not disclose those documents or other information to persons who were not attendees at the Settlement Conference. However, the Parties agree that "attendees" is deemed to include, in this context, persons who were not physically in attendance at the Settlement Conference but were; a) any persons or entities that the Parties engaged to assist them with the Settlement Conference; or b) any persons or entities from whom they seek instructions with respect to the negotiations; in each case provided that any such persons or entities have agreed to be bound by the same confidentiality provisions.

1.3 Parameters of the Settlement Proposal

This document is called a “Settlement Proposal” because it is a proposal by the Parties to the OEB to settle certain issues in this proceeding. It is termed a proposal as between the Parties and the OEB. However, as between the Parties, and subject only to the OEB’s approval of this Proposal, this document is intended to be a legal agreement (“Agreement”), creating mutual obligations, and binding and enforceable in accordance with its terms. As set forth later in this preamble, this Agreement is subject to a condition subsequent, that if it is not accepted by the OEB in its entirety, then unless amended by the Parties it is null and void and of no further effect. In entering into this Agreement, the Parties understand and agree that, pursuant to the Act, the Board has exclusive jurisdiction with respect to the interpretation and enforcement of the terms hereof.

In the event the OEB directs the Parties to make reasonable efforts to revise the Proposal, the Parties agree to use reasonable efforts to discuss any potential revisions, but no party will be obligated to accept any proposed revision. The Parties agree that all of the Parties who took on a position on a particular issue must agree or take no position with any revised Settlement Proposal as it relates to that issue prior to its re-submission to the OEB.

The evidence supporting the Agreement on each issue is cited in each section of the Agreement. Abbreviations will be used when identifying exhibit references. For example, Exhibit A1, Tab 4, Schedule 1, page 1 will be referred to as A1/T4/S1/p.1.

The structure and presentation of the settled issues is consistent with settlement proposals which have been accepted by the OEB in prior cases. The Parties agree that this Agreement forms part of the record in this proceeding. The identification and listing of the evidence that relates to each issue is provided to assist the OEB. The identification and listing of the evidence that relates to each issue is not intended to limit any party who wishes to assert, either in any other proceeding, or in a hearing in this proceeding, that other evidence is relevant to a particular issue, or that evidence listed is not relevant to the issue, or that the concise description of the issue prepared by Enbridge Gas is incorrect or incomplete.

According to the Practice Direction, page 4, the Parties must consider whether a Settlement Proposal should include an appropriate adjustment mechanism for any settled issue that may be affected by external factors. The Parties who participated in the settlement discussions agree that no settled issue requires an adjustment mechanism.

None of the Parties can withdraw from this Settlement Proposal except in accordance with Rule 30.05 of the OEB's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Moreover, the settlement of any particular issue in this proceeding and the positions of the Parties in this Settlement Proposal are without prejudice to the rights of the Parties to raise the same issue and/or to take any position thereon in any other proceeding, whether or not Enbridge Gas is a party to such proceeding.

SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

As set out below, the Parties have reached an Agreement covering some of the issues in this proceeding. For ease of reference, the Settlement Proposal follows the format of the Approved Issues List, as per Procedural Order No. 2, Schedule A. Further, the table below provides a summary of the issues in the Proposal.

Status	Issue No.
Settled. An issue for which complete settlement was reached by all parties.	2; 3; 4; 5 a, c – f; 6; 7 b-d; 8
Unsettled. An issue for which there is not a settlement, and the Parties propose be dealt with by way of written or oral hearing.	1; 5 b, g- l; 7 a; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13

1. Has Enbridge Gas responded appropriately to all relevant OEB directions from previous proceedings?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether Enbridge Gas responded appropriately to all relevant OEB directions from previous proceedings.

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 28 - 29	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/p. 40	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/Appendix G	Enbridge Gas Commitments and Directives
Exhibit I.STAFF.4, 5, 6, 7, 10	
Exhibit I.BOMA.5	
Exhibit I.CCC.4	
Exhibit I.EP.1, 5,	
Exhibit I.FRPO.13	
Exhibit I.SEC.16	

2. Is the Price Cap Index calculated appropriately?

Settled

There is an agreement to settle this issue as described below.

The Parties accept Enbridge Gas’s PCI calculation of 1.07% for the purpose of setting 2019 rates. PCI growth is driven by an inflation factor using GDP IPI FDD, less a productivity factor of zero and a stretch factor of 0.30%. For 2019, the inflation factor is 1.37% and the X factor is 0.30% resulting in a PCI of 1.07%.

The issue of what PCI calculation should be used in determination of the Union rate zones’ ICM materiality threshold will be discussed in the context of the ICM funding requests (Issue No. 11 – 12).

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe,
 FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNNG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 1 - 5	Rate Setting Mechanism
Exhibit I.BOMA.1	
Exhibit I.CCC.1	
Exhibit I.EP.4	
Exhibit I.LPMA.6	

3. **Does the accounting order wording in the following new accounts appropriately reflect the OEB's MAADs Decision?**
- a. **Earnings Sharing Mechanism Deferral Account (Enbridge Gas)**
 - b. **Tax Variance Deferral Account (Enbridge Gas)**
 - c. **Accounting Policy Changes Deferral Account (Enbridge Gas)**

Settled

There is an agreement to settle this issue as described below.

In accordance with the MAADs Decision, Enbridge Gas has provided draft accounting orders to: 1) record accounting policy changes as a result of amalgamation, 2) record any ratepayer portion of excess utility earnings, and 3) to extend the Union rate zones' Tax Variance Deferral Account to the EGD rate zone. The Parties agree that Enbridge Gas's accounting orders, including the changes set out in Exhibit I.STAFF.19, appropriately reflect the OEB's MAADs Decision.

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe, FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNNG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 14 – 16	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/Appendix A	EGD rate zone accounting orders
B1/T1/S1/Appendix B	Union rate zones accounting orders
Exhibit I.STAFF.16, 19	
Exhibit I.BOMA.13	
Exhibit I.EP.6	

4. Should the following deferral accounts be established?

a. Incremental Capital Module – EGD Rate Zone

b. Incremental Capital Module – Union Gas Rate Zones

Settled

There is an agreement to settle this issue as described below.

The Board approved the use of ICM as a mechanism for the funding of incremental capital in the MAADs Decision. The Parties accept Enbridge Gas's evidence that the two ICM deferral accounts should be established to capture any variances between the actual revenue requirements of the ICM projects and the actual ICM revenue collected through the approved ICM rate. As part of this Agreement, Enbridge Gas has agreed to track any ICM funding requests in the deferral accounts on a project-by-project basis.

For greater certainty, certain issues related to ICM accounting are unsettled, as follows:

- Using an average PCI in the determination of the Union rate zone ICM threshold (see Issue 12)
- The inclusion of O&M and property taxes in the ICM revenue requirement (see Issue 10)

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe,

FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNNG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 16	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/Appendix A/p. 33	EGD rate zone accounting orders
B1/T1/S1/Appendix B/p. 34	Union rate zones accounting orders
Exhibit I.STAFF.20	
Exhibit I.BOMA.	
Exhibit I.CCC.12	
Exhibit I.EP.14	
Exhibit I.LPMA.1	
Exhibit I.SEC.	
JT1.4	

5. Should the proposed changes be made to the accounting orders for the following deferral accounts?

EGD Rate Zone

- a. 179.24 Post Retirement True-up Variance Account
- b. 179.48 Open Bill Revenue Variance Account
- c. 179.08 Ex-Franchise Third Party Billing Services Deferral Account
- d. 179.70 Purchased Gas Variance Account
- e. 179.88 Storage and Transportation Deferral Account
- f. 179.94 OEB Cost Assessment Variance Account

Union Gas Rate Zones

- g. 179-136 Parkway West Project Costs
- h. 179-137 Brantford-Kirkwall/Parkway D Project Costs
- i. 179-142 Lobo C Compressor/Hamilton to Milton Project Costs
- j. 179-144 Dawn H/Lobo D/Bright C Compressor Project Costs
- k. 179-149 Burlington Oakville Project Costs
- l. 179-156 Panhandle Reinforcement Project Costs

Partially Settled

There is an agreement to partially settle Issue No. 5 as described below.

As per the MAADs Decision, Enbridge Gas proposed to make changes to the wording of certain existing deferral accounts. The Parties accept Enbridge Gas's evidence that the proposed changes should be made to the accounting orders for the EGD rate zone deferral accounts (parts a, c to f), except for account No. 179.48, the Open Bill Revenue Variance Account (part b). Further, the proposed changes to the accounting orders for the Union rate zones' deferral accounts are unsettled (parts g to l). The proposed changes to the Union rate zones' deferral accounts are tied to the outcome of the Board's Decision with respect to the one-time capital pass-through base rate adjustment (Issue No. 7, part a).

Further, the Parties do not agree with Enbridge Gas's proposal to build into rates the surplus Dawn-Parkway capacity of 30,393 GJ/d resulting from the 2017 Dawn-Parkway proceeding (EB-2015-0200). As part of the 2017 Dawn-Parkway proceeding, parties agreed Union would credit the Lobo D/Bright C/Dawn H Compressor Project Deferral Account (Account No. 179-144) for revenue generated from the 30,393 GJ/d of surplus capacity.

As part of this Agreement, Enbridge Gas agrees to continue its disposition of the referenced 30,393 GJ/d surplus capacity as part of its annual Deferral and Variance Account proceedings, rather than the base rate adjustment proposed in this 2019 rate application. The methodology used to calculate the amount of revenue attributed to the

surplus capacity and the methodology used to allocate and dispose of that revenue will both be consistent with the Board’s Decision and Order in Union’s 2017 Deferral and Variance Account proceeding.¹

If the Board approves the proposed one-time capital pass-through base rate adjustment described above, the final accounting order for Account No. 179-144 will be amended to include the revenue generated from the 30,393 GJ/d of surplus capacity in addition to the tax timing differences.

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe,

FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNNG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 16 - 21	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/Appendix A	EGD rate zone accounting orders
B1/T1/S1/Appendix B	Union rate zones accounting orders
Exhibit I.STAFF.11, 17	
Exhibit I.APPrO.1	
Exhibit I.BOMA.3, 4,16	
Exhibit I.CCC.6	
Exhibit I.EP.7, 8	
Exhibit I.FRPO.4, 5, 9	
Exhibit I.LPMA.2, 3	
Exhibit I.SEC.5	
Exhibit I.VECC.6	
JT1.18, JT1.20, JT1.21, JT1.22, JT1.23, JT1.25	

6. Should the following deferral and variance accounts be discontinued as proposed?

¹ EB-2018-0105 Decision and Order, November 26, 2018, pages 7 – 11.

- a. **179-100 Union North Tolls and Fuel**
- b. **179-105 Union North PGVA**
- c. **179-103 Unbundled Services Unauthorized Storage Overrun Deferral Account**

Settled

There is an agreement to settle Issue No. 6 as described below.

The Parties accept Enbridge Gas's evidence to discontinue the Union North Tolls and Fuel (Account No. 179-100) and Union North PGVA (Account No. 179-105) deferral accounts. Consistent with the Dawn Reference Price Settlement Proposal (EB-2015-0181), these deferral accounts have been replaced with new Union North deferral accounts (Account No. 179-148 and Account No. 179-147). As part of the October 1, 2018 QRAM, Union transferred the last recovery variance to the new Union North deferral accounts. The recovery variances are now zero and there are no further transfers required.

Enbridge Gas agrees to keep the Unbundled Services Unauthorized Storage Overrun Deferral Account (No. 179-103) open, as per the agreement outlined in Issue No. 8. In its evidence, Enbridge Gas proposed that Deferral Account No. 179-103 be discontinued in conjunction with its proposal to eliminate the Rate U2 rate schedule in the Union rate zones.

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, CCC, Energy Probe, FRPO, IGUA,
LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: Kitchener, SNNG, TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 21 – 23	Rate Setting Mechanism
B1/T1/S1/Appendix B	Union rate zones accounting orders
Exhibit I.STAFF.9	

7. Are any rate design proposals appropriate in the context of previous OEB decisions, including:

- a. One-time adjustment for Capital Pass-Through Projects**
- b. General service monthly customer charge**
- c. Parkway Delivery Obligation adjustment**
- d. DSM budget allocations**

Partially Settled

There is an agreement to partially settle Issue No. 7 as described below.

For the purposes of 2019 rates the Parties agree that the Parkway Delivery Obligation (“PDO”) adjustment and DSM budget allocations are appropriate (parts c and d). The PDO Settlement Framework was established to permanently shift the PDO of Union South direct purchase customers to Dawn over time. In the Application, Enbridge Gas has updated the PDO and PDCI costs to reflect the 2019 Rate M12 Dawn-Parkway toll and Dawn-Parkway compressor fuel, based on Union’s October 2018 QRAM (EB-2018-0253) consistent with the PDO Settlement Framework. With respect to the DSM budget

allocations, in its Application Enbridge Gas proposes to allocate the 2019 DSM budget costs in proportion to Union's actual DSM program costs for 2017. The use of 2017 actual DSM program costs is intended to reduce any variance between the allocated costs included in 2019 rates and the actual 2019 DSM program costs for each rate class, which is trued-up in the DSM Variance Account (Account No. 179-111).

The Parties agree that Enbridge Gas will update its proposed calculation of the general service monthly customer charge, part b), by applying the approved PCI of 1.07% to all charges, including the general service monthly customer charges. Please see Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 for the unit rate and bill impacts associated with the updated calculation for the EGD and Union rate zones, respectively.

Enbridge Gas's proposal to include a one-time adjustment for capital pass-through Projects is unsettled (part a). In the Application, Enbridge Gas requests a one-time adjustment associated with the capital pass-through projects that were included in rates as a Y factor during Union's 2014-2018 IRM term. As discussed as part of Issue No. 5, the outcome of the Board's Decision of this issue, part a), is tied to Enbridge Gas's proposed changes to the capital pass-through deferral and variance accounts.

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe,
FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNNG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 26 - 33	Rate Setting Mechanism
Exhibit I.STAFF.8, 12, 13, 14, 23	
Exhibit I.BOMA.6, 14, 15	
Exhibit I.EP.9, 10	
Exhibit I.FRPO.6, 8, 11	
Exhibit I.LPMA.4, 5, 7, 8	
Exhibit I.SEC.1, 3, 6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21	
JT1.1, JT1.2, JT1.3, JT1.8, JT1.17	

8. Are there any necessary rate schedule changes, and if so, are the changes appropriate?

Settled

There is an agreement to settle Issue No. 8 as described below.

The Parties agree that Enbridge Gas’s proposed rate schedule changes will not be dealt with until rebasing.

Proposed Rate Schedule Changes:

- System Expansion Surcharge Term Update
- Elimination of Union South Rate U2
- Elimination of Union South Supplemental Services
- Elimination of Union South Multiple Delivery Points Service Option (“Fuel Manager”)
- Rate C1 Interruptible Transportation Within Dawn
- Rate M13 GT&C Changes

Approval

Parties in Support: APPrO, BOMA, CME, Kitchener, CCC, Energy Probe,

FRPO, IGUA, LPMA, OAPPA, OGVG, OPI, QMA, SEC, SNGG, VECC

Parties Taking no Position: TC Energy

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/pp. 34 - 39	Rate Setting Mechanism
Exhibit I.STAFF.15, 22	
Exhibit I.LPMA.9	

9. Do the USP and AMPs support approval of the ICMs?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether the USP and AMPs support approval of the ICM funding requests.

Evidence

C1/T1/S1	Enbridge Gas Utility System Plan
C1/T2/S1	EGD Rate Zone Asset Management Plan
C1/T3/S1	Union Rate Zones Asset Management Plan
Exhibit I.STAFF.27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80	
Exhibit I.BOMA.8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 69, 75, 79, 83	
Exhibit I.CME.5	
Exhibit I.CCC.14, 15, 16, 18	
Exhibit I.EP.18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37	
Exhibit I.FRPO.16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26	
Exhibit I.SEC.2	
Exhibit I.VECC.12, 13	

10. Are the costs of the ICM projects appropriate, to the extent that they differ from the costs considered by the OEB in granting leave to construct?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether the costs of the ICM projects are appropriate. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, there is no agreement on

whether OM&A or property taxes should be included, or whether capitalized overheads should be added to capital costs.

Evidence

B1/T2/S1	Incremental Capital Module
C1/T1/S1	Enbridge Gas Utility System Plan
C1/T2/S1	EGD Rate Zone Asset Management Plan
C1/T3/S1	Union Rate Zones Asset Management Plan
Exhibit I.STAFF.25, 26	
Exhibit I.APPrO.4	
Exhibit I.BOMA.37, 38, 63, 65, 68, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78	
Exhibit I.CME.3, 4	
Exhibit I.CCC.7, 8, 9, 10, 11	
Exhibit I.EP.16	
Exhibit I.FRPO.14	
Exhibit I.SEC.10, 12, 13, 17	
JT1.6, JT1.7, JT1.12, JT1.13, JT1.26, JT1.27, JT2.1, JT2.2, JT2.3, JT2.4, JT2.5	

11. Is the NPS 30 Don River Replacement Project in the EGD rate zone eligible for Incremental Capital Module (ICM) funding?

a. If yes, is the ICM rate rider for the NPS 30 Don River Replacement Project calculated appropriately?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether the NPS 30 Don River Replacement Project in the EGD rate zone is eligible for ICM funding. There is also no agreement as to whether, if the NPS 30 Don River Replacement Project is eligible for ICM funding, the related ICM rate rider is calculated appropriately.

Evidence

B1/T2/S1	Incremental Capital Module
C1/T1/S1	Enbridge Gas Utility System Plan
C1/T2/S1	EGD Rate Zone Asset Management Plan
Exhibit I.BOMA.7, 64, 70, 72, 82	
Exhibit I.CME.2	
Exhibit I.CCC.17	
Exhibit I.EP.12, 13, 17	

Exhibit I.LPMA.10	
Exhibit I.SEC.9, 14, 15	
Exhibit I.VECC.7, 8, 10	

12. Are the Sudbury Replacement Project in the Union North rate zone and the Kingsville Transmission Reinforcement and Stratford Reinforcement projects in the Union South rate zone eligible for ICM funding?

a. If yes, are the ICM rate riders for the Sudbury, Kingsville and Stratford projects calculated appropriately?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether the Sudbury Replacement Project in the Union North rate zone and the Kingsville Transmission Reinforcement and Stratford Reinforcement projects in the Union South rate zone are eligible for ICM funding. There is also no agreement as to whether, if the Sudbury Replacement Project, the Kingsville Transmission Reinforcement and/or the Stratford Reinforcement projects are eligible for ICM funding, the related ICM rate riders are calculated appropriately. For greater certainty, there is no agreement on whether the ICM threshold for Enbridge Gas should be calculated using an average of the annual PCI since its last rebasing for each of the EGD and Union rate zones, which are 1.07% and 0.72% respectively.

Evidence

B1/T2/S1	Incremental Capital Module
C1/T1/S1	Enbridge Gas Utility System Plan
C1/T3/S1	Union Rate Zones Asset Management Plan
Exhibit I.STAFF.24	
Exhibit I.APPrO.2, 3	
Exhibit I.BOMA.7, 64, 70, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81	
Exhibit I.CME.1, 2	
Exhibit I.CCC.17	
Exhibit I.EP.12, 13, 15, 17	
Exhibit I.LPMA.10, 11, 12, 13, 14	
Exhibit I.SEC.9, 11, 14, 15,	

Exhibit I.VECC.7, 8, 9, 10, 11	
JT1.5	

13. Is Enbridge Gas’ customer connection policy and Profitability Index calculation for consumers appropriate and in accordance with OEB guidelines?

Unsettled

There is no agreement to settle the issue of whether Enbridge Gas’s customer connection policy and Profitability Index calculation for consumers are appropriate and in accordance with OEB guidelines.

Evidence

B1/T1/S1/Appendix H	EGD Rate Zone - Economic Feasibility Procedure and Policy
Exhibit I.STAFF.2, 21	
Exhibit I.CCC.13	
Exhibit I.ENGLP.1	
Exhibit I.EP.11, 25	
JT1.9, JT1.11	

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
 EGD Rate Zone
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED UNIT RATES BY RATE CLASS

Line No.	Rate No.	Particulars	Rate Block (m ³)	EB-2018-0249	EB-2018-0305		PCI applied to			
				Approved October 1, 2018	Proposed January 1, 2019		Customer Charge January 1, 2019			
				Rates(1)	Rates (2)	Rate	Rate	Rates	Rate	Rate
				(cents/m ^{3*})	(cents/m ^{3*})	Change	Change %	(cents/m ^{3*})	Change	Change %
				(a)	(b)	(c) = (b)-(a)	(d) = (c/a)	(e)	(f) = (e)-(a)	(g) = (f/a)
RATE 1										
1.01		Customer Charge		\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$20.21	\$0.21	1.07%
1.02		Delivery Charge	First 30	7.5800	7.7418	0.1618	2.13%	7.6353	0.0553	0.73%
1.03			Next 55	6.9619	7.1311	0.1692	2.43%	7.0246	0.0627	0.90%
1.04			Next 85	6.4779	6.6529	0.1750	2.70%	6.5464	0.0685	1.06%
1.05			Over 170	6.1171	6.2964	0.1793	2.93%	6.1900	0.0729	1.19%
RATE 6										
2.01		Customer Charge		\$70.00	\$70.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$70.75	\$0.75	1.07%
2.02		Delivery Charge	First 500	7.2823	7.3356	0.0533	0.73%	7.3049	0.0226	0.31%
2.03			Next 1,050	5.1670	5.2333	0.0663	1.28%	5.2027	0.0357	0.69%
2.04			Next 4,500	3.6857	3.7612	0.0755	2.05%	3.7305	0.0448	1.22%
2.05			Next 7,000	2.7340	2.8154	0.0814	2.98%	2.7847	0.0507	1.85%
2.06			Next 15,250	2.3111	2.3951	0.0840	3.63%	2.3644	0.0533	2.31%
2.07			Over 28,300	2.2049	2.2895	0.0846	3.84%	2.2589	0.0540	2.45%
RATE 9										
3.01		Customer Charge		235.95	\$238.47	\$2.52	1.07%	\$238.47	\$2.52	1.07%
3.02		Delivery Charge	First 20,000	11.2489	11.3693	0.1204	1.07%	11.3693	0.1204	1.07%
3.03			Over 20,000	10.5292	10.6419	0.1127	1.07%	10.6419	0.1127	1.07%
RATE 100										
4.01		Customer Charge		122.01	\$123.32	\$1.31	1.07%	\$123.32	\$1.31	1.07%
4.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		36.0000	36.3852	0.3852	1.07%	36.3852	0.3852	1.07%
4.03		Delivery Charge	First 14,000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%
4.04			Next 28,000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%
4.05			Over 42,000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%	0.0000	0.0000	0.00%
RATE 110										
5.01		Customer Charge		\$587.37	\$587.37	\$0.00	0.00%	\$593.65	\$6.28	1.07%
5.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		22.9100	23.1551	0.2451	1.07%	23.1551	0.2451	1.07%
5.03		Delivery Charge	First 1,000,000	0.5393	0.5458	0.0065	1.21%	0.5433	0.0040	0.74%
5.04			Over 1,000,000	0.3893	0.3933	0.0040	1.03%	0.3908	0.0015	0.37%

Notes:

* Cents/m³ unless otherwise noted.

(1) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 4, Col.(c) - Col.(e).

(2) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 6, Col. (d).

(3) Customer charges and demand charges are escalated by the PCI of 1.07%. Volumetric delivery rates are impacted by the PCI of 1.07% as well as other factors as outlined in Exhibit JT1.8 (2018 base rate adjustments, Average Use/LRAM and DSM unit rates)

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
 EGD Rate Zone
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED UNIT RATES BY RATE CLASS

Line No.	Rate No.	Particulars	Rate Block (m ³)	EB-2018-0249	EB-2018-0305		PCI applied to			
				Approved	Proposed		Customer Charge			
				October 1, 2018	January 1, 2019		January 1, 2019			
			Rates (1)	Rates (2)	Rate	Rate	Rates	Rate	Rate	
				(cents/m ³ *)	(cents/m ³ *)	Change	Change %	(cents/m ³ *)	Change	Change %
				(a)	(b)	(c) = (b)-(a)	(d) = (c/a)	(e)	(f) = (e)-(a)	(g) = (f/a)
RATE 115										
1.01		Customer Charge		\$622.62	\$622.62	\$0.00	0.00%	\$629.28	\$6.66	1.07%
1.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		24.3600	24.6200	0.2600	1.07%	24.6200	0.2600	1.07%
1.03		Delivery Charge	First 1,000,000	0.2079	0.2453	0.0374	18.00%	0.2449	0.0370	17.81%
1.04			Over 1,000,000	0.1079	0.1448	0.0369	34.22%	0.1444	0.0365	33.85%
RATE 125										
2.01		Customer Charge		\$500.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$505.35	\$5.35	1.07%
2.02		Delivery Charge (Cents/Month/m ³ of Contract Dmn)		9.8840	10.1507	0.2667	2.70%	10.1504	0.2664	2.70%
RATE 135 DEC - MAR										
3.01		Customer Charge		115.08	\$115.08	\$0.00	0.00%	\$116.31	\$1.23	1.07%
3.02		Delivery Charge	First 14,000	6.9940	7.1902	0.1962	2.80%	7.1831	0.1891	2.70%
3.03			Next 28,000	5.7938	5.9591	0.1653	2.85%	5.9533	0.1595	2.75%
3.04			Over 42,000	5.3939	5.5487	0.1548	2.87%	5.5433	0.1494	2.77%
RATE 135 APR - NOV										
4.01		Customer Charge		115.08	\$115.08	\$0.00	0.00%	\$116.31	\$1.23	1.07%
4.02		Delivery Charge	First 14,000	2.2940	2.3028	0.0088	0.38%	2.3016	0.0076	0.33%
4.03			Next 28,000	1.5940	1.5937	(0.0003)	-0.02%	1.5929	(0.0011)	-0.07%
4.04			Over 42,000	1.3940	1.3911	(0.0029)	-0.21%	1.3905	(0.0035)	-0.25%
RATE 145										
5.01		Customer Charge		123.34	\$123.34	\$0.00	0.00%	\$124.66	\$1.32	1.07%
5.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		8.2300	8.3181	0.0881	1.07%	8.3181	0.0881	1.07%
5.03		Delivery Charge	First 14,000	2.5737	2.6926	0.1189	4.62%	2.6915	0.1178	4.58%
5.04			Next 28,000	1.2147	1.3217	0.1070	8.81%	1.3207	0.1060	8.73%
5.05			Over 42,000	0.6557	0.7579	0.1022	15.58%	0.7566	0.1009	15.38%
RATE 170										
6.01		Customer Charge		279.31	\$279.31	\$0.00	0.00%	\$282.30	\$2.99	1.07%
6.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		4.0900	4.1300	0.0400	0.98%	4.1338	0.0438	1.07%
6.03		Delivery Charge	First 1,000,000	0.2706	0.1502	(0.1204)	-44.49%	0.1499	(0.1207)	-44.61%
6.04			Over 1,000,000	0.0706	(0.0515)	(0.1221)	-172.97%	(0.0518)	(0.1224)	-173.41%

Notes:

* Cents/m³ unless otherwise noted.

(1) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 4, Col.(c) - Col.(e).

(2) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 6, Col. (d).

(3) Customer charges and demand charges are escalated by the PCI of 1.07%. Volumetric delivery rates are impacted by the PCI of 1.07% as well as other factors as outlined in Exhibit JT1.8 (2018 base rate adjustments, Average Use/LRAM and DSM unit rates)

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
 EGD Rate Zone
 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED UNIT RATES BY RATE CLASS

Line No.	Rate No.	Particulars	Rate Block (m ³)	EB-2018-0249	EB-2018-0305		PCI applied to			
				Approved October 1, 2018	Proposed January 1, 2019		Customer Charge January 1, 2019			
				Rates(1) (cents/m ^{3*})	Rates (2) (cents/m ^{3*})	Rate Change	Rate Change %	Rates (cents/m ^{3*})	Rate Change	Rate Change %
				(a)	(b)	(c) = (b)-(a)	(d) = (c/a)	(e)	(f) = (e)-(a)	(g) = (f/a)
RATE 200										
1.01		Customer Charge		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
1.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		14.7000	14.8573	0.1573	1.07%	14.8573	0.1573	1.07%
1.03		Delivery Charge		(0.0478)	(0.0212)	0.0266	-55.72%	(0.0212)	0.0266	-55.72%
RATE 300 FIRM SERVICE										
2.01		Monthly Customer Charge		500.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	0.00%	\$505.35	\$5.35	1.07%
2.02		Demand Charge (Cents/Month/m ³)		26.6881	27.7771	1.0890	4.08%	27.7429	1.0548	3.95%
RATE 332 Transportation Service										
3.01		Monthly Contract Demand Charge (\$/GJ)		1.2075	1.2204	0.0129	1.07%	1.2204	0.0129	1.07%

Notes:

* Cents/m³ unless otherwise noted.

(1) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 4, Col.(c) - Col.(e).

(2) Exhibit F1, Tab 1, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 6, Col. (d).

(3) Customer charges and demand charges are escalated by the PCI of 1.07%. Volumetric delivery rates are impacted by the PCI of 1.07% as well as other factors as outlined in Exhibit JT1.8 (2018 base rate adjustments, Average Use/LRAM and DSM unit rates)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
Heating & Water Htg.										
Heating, Water Htg. & Other Uses										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
1.1	VOLUME	m ³	3,064	3,064	0	0.00%	4,691	4,691	0	0.00%
1.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%
1.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	264.18	262.21	1.97	0.75%	398.37	395.24	3.13	0.79%
1.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	202.48	202.39	0.09	0.04%	310.00	309.83	0.17	0.05%
1.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	307.95	307.95	0.00	0.00%	471.47	471.45	0.02	0.00%
1.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	1,017.18	1,012.55	4.63	0.46%	1,422.41	1,416.52	5.89	0.42%
1.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	709.23	704.60	4.63	0.66%	950.94	945.07	5.87	0.62%
1.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.3320	0.3305	0.0015	0.46%	0.3032	0.3020	0.0013	0.42%
1.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2315	0.2300	0.0015	0.66%	0.2027	0.2015	0.0013	0.62%
1.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	8.616	8.577	0.0392	0.46%	7.870	7.837	0.0326	0.42%
1.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	6.008	5.968	0.0392	0.66%	5.261	5.229	0.0325	0.62%

Heating Only										
Heating & Water Htg.										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
2.1	VOLUME	m ³	1,955	1,955	0	0.00%	2,005	2,005	0	0.00%
2.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%
2.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	169.40	168.19	1.21	0.72%	176.25	175.02	1.23	0.70%
2.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	129.19	129.13	0.06	0.05%	132.51	132.44	0.07	0.05%
2.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	196.49	196.48	0.01	0.01%	201.53	201.51	0.02	0.01%
2.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	737.65	733.80	3.85	0.52%	752.86	748.97	3.89	0.52%
2.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	541.16	537.32	3.84	0.71%	551.33	547.46	3.87	0.71%
2.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.3773	0.3753	0.0020	0.52%	0.3755	0.3736	0.0019	0.52%
2.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2768	0.2748	0.0020	0.71%	0.2750	0.2730	0.0019	0.71%
2.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	9.793	9.742	0.0511	0.52%	9.745	9.695	0.0503	0.52%
2.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	7.184	7.133	0.0510	0.71%	7.137	7.087	0.0501	0.71%

§ The Load Balancing Charge shown here includes proposed transportation charges

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
		Heating, Pool Htg. & Other Uses				General & Water Htg.				
		<u>(A)</u>	<u>(B)</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>		<u>(A)</u>	<u>(B)</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
3.1	VOLUME	m ³	5,048	5,048	0	0.00%	1,081	1,081	0	0.00%
3.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%
3.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	428.44	425.05	3.39	0.80%	99.38	98.84	0.54	0.55%
3.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	333.63	333.42	0.21	0.06%	71.43	71.39	0.04	0.06%
3.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	507.37	507.33	0.04	0.01%	108.65	108.65	0.00	0.00%
3.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	1,512.01	1,505.80	6.21	0.41%	522.03	518.88	3.15	0.61%
3.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	1,004.64	998.47	6.17	0.62%	413.38	410.23	3.15	0.77%
3.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2995	0.2983	0.0012	0.41%	0.4829	0.4800	0.0029	0.61%
3.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1990	0.1978	0.0012	0.62%	0.3824	0.3795	0.0029	0.77%
3.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	7.947	7.914	0.0326	0.41%	12.813	12.735	0.0773	0.61%
3.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	5.280	5.248	0.0324	0.62%	10.146	10.069	0.0773	0.77%

		Heating & Water Htg.				Heating & Water Htg.				
		<u>(A)</u>	<u>(B)</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>		<u>(A)</u>	<u>(B)</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
3.1	VOLUME	m ³	2,480	2,480	0	0.00%	2,400	2,400	0	0.00%
3.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%	242.57	240.00	2.57	1.07%
3.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	215.65	214.10	1.55	0.72%	208.76	207.26	1.50	0.72%
3.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	163.90	163.80	0.10	0.06%	158.60	158.51	0.09	0.06%
3.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	249.26	249.25	0.01	0.00%	241.24	241.22	0.02	0.01%
3.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	871.38	867.15	4.23	0.49%	851.17	846.99	4.18	0.49%
3.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	622.12	617.90	4.22	0.68%	609.93	605.77	4.16	0.69%
3.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.3514	0.3497	0.0017	0.49%	0.3547	0.3529	0.0017	0.49%
3.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2509	0.2492	0.0017	0.68%	0.2541	0.2524	0.0017	0.69%
3.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	9.322	9.277	0.0452	0.49%	9.410	9.364	0.0462	0.49%
3.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	6.656	6.611	0.0451	0.68%	6.743	6.697	0.0460	0.69%

§ The Load Balancing Charge shown here includes proposed transportation charges

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8
Commercial Heating & Other Uses									
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE					
				(A) - (B)	%				
1.1	VOLUME	m ³	22,606	22,606	0	0.00%			
1.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%			
1.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	1,544.71	1,536.52	8.19	0.53%			
1.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	1,466.37	1,465.53	0.84	0.06%			
1.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	2,276.97	2,276.72	0.25	0.01%			
1.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	6,137.04	6,118.77	18.27	0.30%			
1.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	3,860.07	3,842.05	18.02	0.47%			
1.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2715	0.2707	0.0008	0.30%			
1.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1708	0.1700	0.0008	0.47%			
1.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	7.046	7.025	0.0210	0.30%			
1.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.432	4.411	0.0207	0.47%			
Com. Htg., Air Cond'ng & Other Uses									
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE					
				(A) - (B)	%				
			29,278	29,278	0	0.00%			
			848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%			
			1,982.15	1,971.46	10.69	0.54%			
			1,899.14	1,898.08	1.06	0.06%			
			2,949.00	2,948.67	0.33	0.01%			
			7,679.28	7,658.21	21.07	0.28%			
			4,730.28	4,709.54	20.74	0.44%			
			0.2623	0.2616	0.0007	0.28%			
			0.1616	0.1609	0.0007	0.44%			
			6.807	6.789	0.0187	0.28%			
			4.193	4.175	0.0184	0.44%			
Medium Commercial Customer									
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE					
				(A) - (B)	%				
2.1	VOLUME	m ³	169,563	169,563	0	0.00%			
2.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%			
2.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	8,355.91	8,274.58	81.33	0.98%			
2.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	10,998.90	10,992.63	6.27	0.06%			
2.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	17,079.02	17,077.20	1.82	0.01%			
2.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	37,282.82	37,184.41	98.41	0.26%			
2.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	20,203.80	20,107.21	96.59	0.48%			
2.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2199	0.2193	0.0006	0.26%			
2.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1192	0.1186	0.0006	0.48%			
2.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	5.707	5.692	0.0151	0.26%			
2.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	3.092	3.078	0.0148	0.48%			
Large Commercial Customer									
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE					
				(A) - (B)	%				
			339,125	339,125	0	0.00%			
			848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%			
			15,321.47	15,150.20	171.27	1.13%			
			21,997.75	21,985.16	12.59	0.06%			
			34,157.98	34,154.31	3.67	0.01%			
			72,326.19	72,129.67	196.52	0.27%			
			38,168.21	37,975.36	192.85	0.51%			
			0.2133	0.2127	0.0006	0.27%			
			0.1125	0.1120	0.0006	0.51%			
			5.535	5.520	0.0150	0.27%			
			2.921	2.906	0.0148	0.51%			

§ The Load Balancing Charge shown here includes proposed transportation charges

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
Industrial General Use										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B)	%	
3.1	VOLUME	m ³	43,285	43,285	0	0.00%	63,903	63,903	0	0.00%
3.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%
3.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	2,741.05	2,724.04	17.01	0.62%	3,680.82	3,653.51	27.31	0.75%
3.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	2,807.73	2,806.11	1.62	0.06%	4,145.13	4,142.77	2.36	0.06%
3.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	4,359.84	4,359.35	0.49	0.01%	6,436.55	6,435.86	0.69	0.01%
3.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	10,757.61	10,729.50	28.11	0.26%	15,111.49	15,072.14	39.35	0.26%
3.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	6,397.77	6,370.15	27.62	0.43%	8,674.94	8,636.28	38.66	0.45%
3.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2485	0.2479	0.0006	0.26%	0.2365	0.2359	0.0006	0.26%
3.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1478	0.1472	0.0006	0.43%	0.1358	0.1351	0.0006	0.45%
3.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	6.450	6.433	0.0169	0.26%	6.137	6.121	0.0160	0.26%
3.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	3.836	3.820	0.0166	0.43%	3.523	3.508	0.0157	0.45%
Medium Industrial Customer										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B)	%	
4.1	VOLUME	m ³	169,563	169,563	0	0.00%	339,124	339,124	0	0.00%
4.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%	848.99	840.00	8.99	1.07%
4.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	8,553.64	8,473.60	80.04	0.94%	15,468.60	15,298.26	170.34	1.11%
4.4	LOAD BALANCING	§ \$	10,998.90	10,992.61	6.29	0.06%	21,997.67	21,985.07	12.60	0.06%
4.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	17,079.03	17,077.19	1.84	0.01%	34,157.87	34,154.20	3.67	0.01%
4.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	37,480.56	37,383.40	97.16	0.26%	72,473.13	72,277.53	195.60	0.27%
4.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	20,401.53	20,306.21	95.32	0.47%	38,315.26	38,123.33	191.93	0.50%
4.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2210	0.2205	0.0006	0.26%	0.2137	0.2131	0.0006	0.27%
4.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1203	0.1198	0.0006	0.47%	0.1130	0.1124	0.0006	0.50%
4.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	5.737	5.722	0.0149	0.26%	5.547	5.532	0.0150	0.27%
4.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	3.123	3.108	0.0146	0.47%	2.932	2.918	0.0147	0.50%
Large Industrial Customer										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%	(A)	(B)	(A) - (B)	%	

§ The Load Balancing Charge shown here includes proposed transportation charges

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - LARGE VOLUME CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
		Rate 100 - Small Commercial Firm				Rate 100 - Average Commercial Firm				
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
1.1	VOLUME	m ³	339,188	339,188	0	0.00%	598,567	598,567	0	0.00%
1.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	1,479.79	1,464.12	15.67	1.07%	1,479.79	1,464.12	15.67	1.07%
1.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	13,668.78	13,530.58	138.20	1.02%	66,553.38	65,860.02	693.36	1.05%
1.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	22,001.48	21,989.22	12.26	0.06%	38,826.14	38,804.50	21.64	0.06%
1.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	34,164.33	34,160.63	3.70	0.01%	60,289.97	60,283.49	6.48	0.01%
1.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	71,314.38	71,144.55	169.83	0.24%	167,149.28	166,412.13	737.15	0.44%
1.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	37,150.05	36,983.92	166.13	0.45%	106,859.31	106,128.64	730.67	0.69%
1.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2103	0.2097	0.0005	0.24%	0.2792	0.2780	0.0012	0.44%
1.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1095	0.1090	0.0005	0.45%	0.1785	0.1773	0.0012	0.69%
1.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	5.4568	5.4438	0.0130	0.24%	7.2476	7.2156	0.0320	0.44%
1.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	2.8426	2.8299	0.0127	0.45%	4.6334	4.6017	0.0317	0.69%
		Rate 100 - Large Industrial Firm								
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%					
2.1	VOLUME	m ³	1,500,000	1,500,000	0	0.00%				
2.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	1,479.79	1,464.12	15.67	1.07%				
2.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	133,643.19	132,257.07	1,386.12	1.05%				
2.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	97,297.74	97,243.51	54.22	0.06%				
2.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	151,085.83	151,069.49	16.34	0.01%				
2.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	383,506.54	382,034.19	1,472.35	0.39%				
2.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	232,420.71	230,964.70	1,456.01	0.63%				
2.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.2557	0.2547	0.0010	0.39%				
2.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1549	0.1540	0.0010	0.63%				
2.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	6.6356	6.6102	0.0255	0.39%				
2.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.0215	3.9963	0.0252	0.63%				

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - LARGE VOLUME CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
Rate 145 - Small Commercial Interr.					Rate 145 - Average Commercial Interr.					
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
3.1	VOLUME	m ³	339,188	339,188	0	0.00%	598,568	598,568	0	0.00%
3.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	1,495.92	1,480.08	15.84	1.07%	1,495.92	1,480.08	15.84	1.07%
3.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	10,865.53	10,457.80	407.73	3.90%	16,084.72	15,393.78	690.94	4.49%
3.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	17,342.95	17,335.53	7.42	0.04%	30,605.67	30,592.55	13.12	0.04%
3.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	33,984.56	33,982.91	1.65	0.00%	59,972.81	59,969.93	2.88	0.00%
3.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	63,688.95	63,256.32	432.64	0.68%	108,159.11	107,436.34	722.78	0.67%
3.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	29,704.39	29,273.41	430.99	1.47%	48,186.30	47,466.41	719.90	1.52%
3.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1878	0.1865	0.0013	0.68%	0.1807	0.1795	0.0012	0.67%
3.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0876	0.0863	0.0013	1.47%	0.0805	0.0793	0.0012	1.52%
3.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.8733	4.8402	0.0331	0.68%	4.6898	4.6584	0.0313	0.67%
3.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	2.2729	2.2399	0.0330	1.47%	2.0893	2.0581	0.0312	1.52%
Rate 145 - Small Industrial Interr.					Rate 145 - Average Industrial Interr.					
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
4.1	VOLUME	m ³	339,188	339,188	0	0.00%	598,567	598,567	0	0.00%
4.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	1,495.92	1,480.08	15.84	1.07%	1,495.92	1,480.08	15.84	1.07%
4.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	11,140.77	10,730.61	410.16	3.82%	16,328.39	15,635.24	693.15	4.43%
4.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	17,342.94	17,335.53	7.41	0.04%	30,605.60	30,592.49	13.11	0.04%
4.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	33,984.53	33,982.90	1.63	0.00%	59,972.72	59,969.83	2.89	0.00%
4.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	63,964.15	63,529.12	435.04	0.68%	108,402.62	107,677.64	724.99	0.67%
4.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	29,979.62	29,546.22	433.41	1.47%	48,429.90	47,707.81	722.10	1.51%
4.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1886	0.1873	0.0013	0.68%	0.1811	0.1799	0.0012	0.67%
4.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0884	0.0871	0.0013	1.47%	0.0809	0.0797	0.0012	1.51%
4.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.8944	4.8611	0.0333	0.68%	4.7003	4.6689	0.0314	0.67%
4.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	2.2940	2.2608	0.0332	1.47%	2.0999	2.0686	0.0313	1.51%

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - LARGE VOLUME CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
Rate 110 - Small Ind. Firm - 50% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%					
5.1	VOLUME	m ³	598,568	598,568	0	0.00%				
5.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	7,123.86	7,048.44	75.42	1.07%				
5.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	14,287.73	14,167.31	120.42	0.85%				
5.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	31,517.31	31,511.01	6.30	0.02%				
5.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	59,950.87	59,948.38	2.49	0.00%				
5.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	112,879.77	112,675.14	204.63	0.18%				
5.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	52,928.90	52,726.76	202.14	0.38%				
5.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1886	0.1882	0.0003	0.18%				
5.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0884	0.0881	0.0003	0.38%				
5.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.8944	4.8856	0.0089	0.18%				
5.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	2.2950	2.2862	0.0088	0.38%				
Rate 110 - Average Ind. Firm - 50% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%					
			9,976,121	9,976,121	0	0.00%				
			7,123.86	7,048.44	75.42	1.07%				
			234,306.27	232,346.21	1,960.06	0.84%				
			525,287.86	525,182.92	104.94	0.02%				
			999,179.76	999,138.43	41.33	0.00%				
			1,765,897.75	1,763,716.00	2,181.75	0.12%				
			766,717.99	764,577.57	2,140.42	0.28%				
			0.1770	0.1768	0.0002	0.12%				
			0.0769	0.0766	0.0002	0.28%				
			4.5941	4.5885	0.0057	0.12%				
			1.9947	1.9891	0.0056	0.28%				
Rate 110 - Average Ind. Firm - 75% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%					
6.1	VOLUME	m ³	9,976,120	9,976,120	0	0.00%				
6.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	7,123.86	7,048.44	75.42	1.07%				
6.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	186,852.49	185,388.33	1,464.16	0.79%				
6.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	525,287.81	525,182.86	104.95	0.02%				
6.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	999,179.69	999,138.34	41.35	0.00%				
6.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	1,718,443.85	1,716,757.97	1,685.88	0.10%				
6.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	719,264.16	717,619.63	1,644.53	0.23%				
6.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1723	0.1721	0.0002	0.10%				
6.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0721	0.0719	0.0002	0.23%				
6.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.4707	4.4663	0.0044	0.10%				
6.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	1.8712	1.8670	0.0043	0.23%				
Rate 115 - Large Ind. Firm - 80% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE						
				(A) - (B)	%					
			69,832,850	69,832,850	0	0.00%				
			7,551.38	7,471.44	79.94	1.07%				
			975,668.68	942,649.06	33,019.62	3.50%				
			3,531,586.73	3,531,167.89	418.84	0.01%				
			6,994,258.73	6,993,969.44	289.29	0.00%				
			11,509,065.52	11,475,257.83	33,807.69	0.29%				
			4,514,806.79	4,481,288.39	33,518.40	0.75%				
			0.1648	0.1643	0.0005	0.29%				
			0.0647	0.0642	0.0005	0.75%				
			4.2774	4.2648	0.0126	0.29%				
			1.6780	1.6655	0.0125	0.75%				

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ANNUAL BILL COMPARISON - LARGE VOLUME CUSTOMERS - DISTRIBUTION ONLY

(PCI applied to customer charges)

(A) EB-2018-0305 @ 38.53 MJ/m³ vs. (B) EB-2018-0249 @ 38.53 MJ/m³

Item No.		Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	
Rate 135 - Seasonal Firm										
Rate 170 - Average Ind. Interr. - 50% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
7.1	VOLUME	m ³	598,567	598,567	0	0.00%	9,976,121	9,976,121	0	0.00%
7.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	1,395.74	1,380.96	14.78	1.07%	3,387.58	3,351.72	35.86	1.07%
7.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	10,760.88	10,761.83	(0.95)	-0.01%	68,453.51	80,225.54	(11,772.03)	-14.67%
7.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	24,532.43	24,530.66	1.77	0.01%	404,109.60	404,005.02	104.58	0.03%
7.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	59,993.38	59,989.58	3.80	0.01%	999,179.50	999,138.43	41.07	0.00%
7.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	96,682.42	96,663.03	19.40	0.02%	1,475,130.19	1,486,720.71	(11,590.52)	-0.78%
7.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	36,689.04	36,673.45	15.60	0.04%	475,950.69	487,582.28	(11,631.59)	-2.39%
7.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1615	0.1615	0.0000	0.02%	0.1479	0.1490	(0.0012)	-0.78%
7.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0613	0.0613	0.0000	0.04%	0.0477	0.0489	(0.0012)	-2.39%
7.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	4.1921	4.1913	0.0008	0.02%	3.8377	3.8678	(0.0302)	-0.78%
7.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	1.5908	1.5902	0.0007	0.04%	1.2382	1.2685	(0.0303)	-2.39%
Rate 170 - Average Ind. Interr. - 75% LF										
Rate 170 - Large Ind. Interr. - 75% LF										
		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		(A)	(B)	CHANGE		
				(A) - (B)	%			(A) - (B)	%	
8.1	VOLUME	m ³	9,976,120	9,976,120	0	0.00%	69,832,850	69,832,850	0	0.00%
8.2	CUSTOMER CHG.	\$	3,387.58	3,351.72	35.86	1.07%	3,387.58	3,351.72	35.86	1.07%
8.3	DISTRIBUTION CHG.	\$	61,188.94	73,040.69	(11,851.75)	-16.23%	311,757.24	395,716.60	(83,959.36)	-21.22%
8.4	LOAD BALANCING	\$	404,109.57	404,004.96	104.61	0.03%	2,828,767.42	2,828,035.26	732.16	0.03%
8.5	SALES COMMDTY	\$	999,179.41	999,138.34	41.07	0.00%	6,994,256.86	6,993,969.44	287.42	0.00%
8.6	TOTAL SALES	\$	1,467,865.51	1,479,535.71	(11,670.21)	-0.79%	10,138,169.11	10,221,073.02	(82,903.92)	-0.81%
8.7	TOTAL T-SERVICE	\$	468,686.10	480,397.37	(11,711.28)	-2.44%	3,143,912.25	3,227,103.58	(83,191.34)	-2.58%
8.8	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.1471	0.1483	(0.0012)	-0.79%	0.1452	0.1464	(0.0012)	-0.81%
8.9	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/m ³	0.0470	0.0482	(0.0012)	-2.44%	0.0450	0.0462	(0.0012)	-2.58%
8.10	SALES UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	3.8188	3.8491	(0.0304)	-0.79%	3.7679	3.7987	(0.0308)	-0.81%
8.11	T-SERVICE UNIT RATE	\$/GJ	1.2193	1.2498	(0.0305)	-2.44%	1.1685	1.1994	(0.0309)	-2.58%

Notes:

The proposed bill impact on customers at different (typical) consumption volume for each customer class as filed in the 2019 rate application can be found at Exhibit F1, Tab1, Working Papers, Schedule 3 Pages 1-8 (EB-2018-0305)

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
 Union Rate Zones
Summary of General Service Unit Rates by Rate Class

Line No.	Particulars (cents/m ³)	EB-2018-0253	EB-2018-0305		PCI Applied to			
		Approved	Proposed		Monthly Charge (3)			
		October 1, 2018	January 1, 2019	Rate	Rate	January 1, 2019	Rate	Rate
	Rates (1)	Rates (2)	Change	Change (%)	Rates	Change	Change (%)	
	(a)	(b)	(c) = (b - a)	(d) = (c / a)	(e)	(f) = (e - a)	(g) = (f / a)	
<u>Union North - General Service</u>								
<u>Rate 01</u>								
1	Monthly Charge	\$21.00	\$21.00	-	0.00%	\$21.22	\$0.22	1.07%
	Monthly Delivery Charge							
2	First 100 m ³	9.3755	10.0484	0.6729	7.18%	9.5616	0.1861	1.98%
3	Next 200 m ³	9.1356	9.2549	0.1193	1.31%	9.3272	0.1916	2.10%
4	Next 200 m ³	8.7563	8.8872	0.1309	1.49%	8.9566	0.2003	2.29%
5	Next 500 m ³	8.4081	8.5496	0.1415	1.68%	8.6162	0.2081	2.47%
6	Over 1,000 m ³	8.1204	8.2708	0.1504	1.85%	8.3351	0.2147	2.64%
<u>Rate 10</u>								
7	Monthly Charge	\$70.00	\$70.00	-	0.00%	\$70.75	\$0.75	1.07%
	Monthly Delivery Charge							
8	First 1,000 m ³	7.9011	8.2572	0.3561	4.51%	8.2493	0.3482	4.41%
9	Next 9,000 m ³	6.4155	6.7388	0.3233	5.04%	6.7680	0.3525	5.49%
10	Next 20,000 m ³	5.7447	6.0762	0.3315	5.77%	6.0412	0.2965	5.16%
11	Next 70,000 m ³	5.1855	5.5209	0.3354	6.47%	5.4893	0.3038	5.86%
12	Over 100,000 m ³	3.0670	3.4170	0.3500	11.41%	3.3983	0.3313	10.80%
<u>Union South - General Service</u>								
<u>Rate M1</u>								
13	Monthly Charge	\$21.00	\$21.00	-	0.00%	\$21.22	\$0.22	1.07%
	Delivery Charge							
14	First 100 m ³	5.0777	5.9775	0.8998	17.72%	5.2796	0.2019	3.98%
15	Next 150 m ³	4.8140	4.8283	0.0143	0.30%	5.0050	0.1910	3.97%
16	All over 250 m ³	4.1326	4.1436	0.0110	0.27%	4.2953	0.1627	3.94%
<u>Rate M2</u>								
17	Monthly Charge	\$70.00	\$70.00	-	0.00%	\$70.75	\$0.75	1.07%
	Delivery Charge							
18	First 1,000 m ³	5.0510	4.9042	(0.1468)	-2.91%	4.8976	(0.1534)	-3.04%
19	Next 6,000 m ³	4.9552	4.7581	(0.1971)	-3.98%	4.8047	(0.1505)	-3.04%
20	Next 13,000 m ³	4.7739	4.5915	(0.1824)	-3.82%	4.5649	(0.2090)	-4.38%
21	All over 20,000 m ³	4.4236	4.2540	(0.1696)	-3.83%	4.2293	(0.1943)	-4.39%

Notes:

- (1) Exhibit F1, Tab 2, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 5, column (c).
- (2) Exhibit F1, Tab 2, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 6, column (e).
- (3) Monthly charges are escalated by the PCI of 1.07%. Volumetric delivery charges are impacted by the PCI of 1.07% as well as other factors as provided at Exhibit F1, Tab 2, Rate Order, Working Papers, Schedule 5.

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
Union Rate Zones
Delivery Bill Impacts
(PCI applied to monthly charges)

Line No.	Particulars (\$)	Small Volume General Service				Large Volume General Service			
		Union South		Union North		Union South		Union North	
		Rate M1	Rate M1	Rate 01	Rate 01	Rate M2	Rate M2	Rate 10	Rate 10
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
1	Annual Consumption	2,200 m ³	40,000 m ³	2,200 m ³	40,000 m ³	60,000 m ³	250,000 m ³	60,000 m ³	250,000 m ³
2	Approved Delivery Bill (1)	374	2,222	455	3,570	4,196	14,266	4,868	16,059
3	2019 Rates - Current Approved Rate Design	381	2,336	461	3,690	4,123	13,876	5,086	16,879
4	Difference (line 3 - line 2)	7	114	6	119	(73)	(390)	218	820
5	Delivery Bill Impact (%) (line 4 / line 2)	1.9%	5.2%	1.4%	3.3%	-1.7%	-2.7%	4.5%	5.1%
6	2019 Rates - Proposed (1)	384	2,250	463	3,635	4,100	13,877	5,065	16,883
7	Difference (line 6 - line 2)	10	28	8	65	(96)	(389)	198	824
8	Delivery Bill Impact (%) (line 7 / line 2)	2.7%	1.3%	1.8%	1.8%	-2.3%	-2.7%	4.1%	5.1%
9	2019 Rates - PCI Applied to Monthly Charge	381	2,304	461	3,657	4,123	13,872	5,088	16,875
10	Difference (line 9 - line 2)	8	82	7	87	(73)	(395)	220	815
11	Delivery Bill Impact (%) (line 10 / line 2)	2.0%	3.7%	1.5%	2.4%	-1.7%	-2.8%	4.5%	5.1%

Note:

(1) Small volume general service per Exhibit B1, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Table 11. Large volume general service per Exhibit I.LPMA.4, Table 1.

Enbridge Gas Inc.

Follow up questions from Intervenors

To provide CCA continuity schedule and revenue requirement impact of accelerated CCA (Bill C-97) for 2019

Response:

Assuming the accelerated CCA legislation is enacted in 2019, the forecast change in 2019 CCA will range from an increase of \$84M to \$121M. The forecast CCA impacts are dependent on the treatment of 2019 opening CWIP balances, and the assumption as to whether the amounts will qualify for accelerated CCA. To quantify the range of the potential impact of proposed accelerated CCA, the Company has forecast the impact under two scenarios, first, no opening CWIP qualifies for accelerated CCA, and second, all opening CWIP qualifies for accelerated CCA. Please see table 1 below. A full continuity schedule is provided as an attachment (See attached excel file).

Table 1

Forecast CCA Change (Year 2019) - Proposed Accelerated CCA vs Current Rules

\$ Millions	Current CCA Rules	Proposed Accelerated CCA			
		Without opening CWIP	CCA Change	With opening CWIP	CCA Change
EGD rate zone	343	386	43	407	64
Union rate zone	380	421	40	437	57
Total	723	807	84	844	121

The change in CCA under the proposed Accelerated CCA will result in higher CCA in the first year the capital addition is made. However, the benefit of the accelerated CCA reverses in subsequent years due to lower UCC balances carried forward, which will result in lower CCA deductions. Table 2 below shows the change in CCA for 2019 to 2023, resulting from the forecast 2019 capital additions.

Table 2

Forecast CCA Change (Year 2019-2023) - Proposed Accelerated CCA vs Current Rules

\$ Millions	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
<u>Assuming Opening 2019 CWIP does not qualify for Accelerated CCA</u>					
EGD rate zone	43	(16)	(4)	(3)	(2)
Union rate zone	40	(8)	(4)	(3)	(3)
Total Change in CCA	84	(23)	(8)	(6)	(5)
<u>Assuming Opening 2019 CWIP qualifies for Accelerated CCA</u>					
EGD rate zone	64	(24)	(6)	(4)	(3)
Union rate zone	57	(15)	(8)	(5)	(3)
Total Change in CCA	121	(39)	(14)	(9)	(7)

The forecast revenue requirement impact, resulting from the proposed accelerated CCA, will range from \$26 to \$39 million for 2019, depending on the treatment of 2019 opening CWIP. Table 3 below shows the calculation of the Revenue Requirement impact of Accelerated CCA.

Table 3

Forecast Revenue Requirement Impact of Accelerated CCA for 2019

\$ Millions	Low	High Notes
1 CCA impact with Bill C-97	84	121 Dependent on the treatment of 2019 opening CWIP
2 Reduction in Income taxes	(22)	(32) Line 1 multiply by the tax rate of 26.5%
3 Revenue requirement of accelerated CCA (on total capital additions)	(30)	(44) Line 2 amount grossed up for taxes
4 Revenue requirement of accelerated CCA (ICM projects)	4	4 ICM rev. req. will be trued up through the ICM Deferral a/c
5 Net revenue Requirement impact of Accelerated CCA	(26)	(39)