**REF:** Exhibit B / Tab 1 / Sch. 1 / pg. 2

Preamble: EGI's evidence states: "*There are a number of other factors related to its condition that are equally as relevant when considering the need for replacement. Such factors include:*

• *History of leakage with significant costs to repair*

We would like to understand better this history.

1) Please provide recent repair history including amount of time between detection, category and repair and cost.

**REF:** Exhibit B / Tab 1 / Sch. 1 / pg. 3

Preamble: We would like to understand better how EGI is mitigating any risks associated with the higher operating pressure.

2) Are there or will there be any sources of moisture into the new 3450kPa pipe (e.g., local production, etc.? Please explain.

3) How will EGI mitigate risk of freeze off at the initial pressure cut?

**REF:** Exhibit B / Tab 1 / Sch. 5 / pg. 1

Preamble We would like to understand better the scale and scope of this project in relation to the capital budget of the legacy Union territory.

4) Please provide:
   a) The replacement capital budget for 2020
      i) The top 5 projects by project estimate
   b) The actual replacement capital for the years 2014-2018
      i) The top 5 projects by actual expenditures for each year

**REF:** Exhibit B / Tab 1 / Sch. 5 / pg. 3

Preamble: We would like to understand better the impact of the new services on the project.

5) How many new services will be added? What is the cost estimate for the new services portion of the project?

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 1 / Sch. 1 / pg. 1

Preamble: We would like to understand better the pipeline network that supplies the area.

6) Please re-create this map showing all surrounding and interconnected pipelines.
   a) Please provide the size, Maximum and Minimum operating pressures and flow direction of those lines.

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 / pg. 1

7) Provide the other pipelines, sizes, locations, directions of flow and MOP's including non-Enbridge pipelines. Please show the design day forecasted pressures upstream and downstream of inter-connects between pipelines for the winter of 2019/20.

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 5

8) Please confirm that the temperature of 25.1 is actually minus 25.1.

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 6

9) Please provide the design day flows at the respective connections and distribution stations on the line.

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 10

10) Please provide the simulated pressures vs. actual pressure at the distribution stations and interconnections from the verification process.

11) Please provide the flow capacity to Leamington before and after the replacement to 3450 kPa.

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 12

12) Was NPS 4 evaluated? If not, why not? If so, please provide the distribution station pressures:
   i) with current design
   ii) with current design replacing the "Remaining Pipeline" as NPS 6

13) What is the cost differential of NPS 4 vs. NPS 6?

14) Did EGI evaluate a hyrid of NPS 6 in some sections and NPS 4 in others?

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 16

15) Using a NPS 4 for the entire project and the forecast in Appendix 2, in what year would the pressures reach inadequate levels?
   a) Leaving the new proposed pipe as NPS 4 as the majority, how much NPS 6 would be needed to extend the capacity to meet the forecasted additions in Appendix 2?

**REF:** Exhibit C / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / pg. 23 / App. 1

16) Please add the cost of NPS 4 and the combined NPS 6 and NPS 4 to the table.