

July 6, 2020

Christine Long  
Registrar and Board Secretary  
Ontario Energy Board  
2300 Yonge Street  
P.O. Box 2319  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Long:

**EB-2020-0095 - Enbridge Gas Inc. – SES, TCS and HAF – System Expansion**

Please find, attached, interrogatories on behalf of the Consumers Council of Canada for Enbridge Gas Inc. pursuant to the above-referenced proceeding.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions.

Yours truly,

*Julie E. Girvan*

Julie E. Girvan

CC: EGI, Regulatory Affairs  
All Parties

## **INTEROGATORIES FOR ENBRIDGE GAS INC.**

**RE: EB-2020-0095**

### **COMMUNITY EXPANSION SURCHARGES AND ALLOCATION FACTORS**

#### **FROM THE CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA**

**Ex. B/T1/S1/p. 2**

The evidence states that customers that consume more than 50,000 m<sup>3</sup> per year will have the option of paying the SES or negotiating another method of contribution to the project. Please explain how EGI would “negotiate another method of contribution to the project”. What would the other options be? Please provide a list of the options and please provide examples of how these options would work. Please provide examples of how customers would contribute to the project other than paying the TCS.

**Ex. B/T1/S1/p. 3-4**

Please indicate when the \$.23 per cubic meter surcharge was approved by the OEB. Please explain the basis on which it was derived. Please provide the study referred to in the evidence related to small volume customers’ energy costs and conversion costs? Has this study been updated? If not, why has it not been updated? Did EGI consider proposing a different surcharge? If not, why did it not do so? If so, why was a different surcharge rejected by EGI?

**Ex. B/T1/S1/pp. 3-4**

Please explain the difference between a Development Project and a Small Main Extension or Customer Attachment Project. Please define “Small Main Extension” and “Customer Attachment Project”.

**Ex. B/T1/S1/p. 5**

Please provide examples of the information provided to customers for Community Expansion projects related to the SES charge.

**Ex. B/T1/S1/p. 7**

EGI proposes that any shortfalls or excesses resulting in the first 10 years of a project during the Rate Stabilization Period would be brought forward in future rebasing proceedings for disposition. What is EGI’s current thinking as to how the revenue excesses or shortfalls should be treated?

**Ex. B/T1/S1/ 6**

Please explain, in detail, how EGI develops estimated capital costs and forecasts of customer attachments for its Community Expansion Projects.

**Ex. B/T1/S1/pp. 6-7**

Has EGI ever undertaken any analyses to assess the potential ranges of shortfalls or revenue excesses that could occur during a 10-Year Rate Stabilization Period? If so, please provide those analyses.

**Ex. B/T1/S1**

Please provide a list of all potential projects that EGI has identified that would be subject to the SES, TCS and HAF. Please provide the expected in-service date for each of those projects.

**Ex. B/T1/S1/p. 12**

With respect to the TCS the evidence states that the 20-year maximum may not make all projects economically viable, in which case EGI expects that a CIAC will be required in addition to the TCS. Please set out the methodology that EG would use to determine a customer's CIAC. Please provide an example.

**Ex. B/T1/S1**

Please describe the reporting to the OEB that EGI will undertake with respect to the projects that EGI will undertake that would be subject to these new charges.

**Ex. C/T2/S1/p. 2**

Please indicate when the rate of \$32 per metre was approved by the OEB for a service length beyond 20 metres. Please explain how the \$32 was derived.