

Filed: 2020-08-21
Section 101
EB-2020-0160

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF the *Energy Board Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998, c. 15 (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas Inc. pursuant to Condition 4 from the Ontario Energy Board's Decision and Order, and Section 101 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998 for authority to construct a work upon, under or over a highway, utility line or ditch in the County of Essex for the purposes of a natural gas pipeline in respect of which the Ontario Energy Board granted leave to construct in EB-2019-0172 to Enbridge Gas Inc.;

ANSWERS OF THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY OF ESSEX TO INTERROGATORIES FROM FEDERATION OF RENTAL-HOUSING PROVIDERS OF ONTARIO (FRPO)

FRPO – Q # 1

Reference: Response of the Intervenor, the Corporation of the County of Essex, Tab 2, Exhibit B, page 3 of 4, Exhibit F, pages 2-3 of 4, Exhibit H, page 2 of 9 and page 7 of 9

Preamble: The evidence of the County includes: "*Mr. Bain expressed concern over the replacement of a pipeline, with another that would not increase the capacity for the serviced area. He referenced previous communications with Union Gas about capacity, which indicated that if the municipality intended on expanding commercial/industrial development, there would not be adequate resources available to support this. He questioned that with Essex County development expanding rapidly, why would the replacement of the pipeline not be done with a larger capacity line, to support growth.*"

From FRPO's read of the County's evidence, Council had expressed concern over the available capacity once the replacement pipe was in place (provided reference above). The evidence (some references above) provides numerous attempts by staff to understand the capacity of the replacement pipe. The response that FRPO reads is that the new pipe will have "like for like" capacity that will meet the twenty year forecast.

Answers of the Corporation of the County of Essex to the Interrogatories of FRPO
Page 2

FRPO would like to understand the County's understanding of the ability of the replacement pipe to meet future needs.

Question a): *Please provide Essex County's understanding of the amount of capacity available from the replacement pipeline in comparison: a) to the capacity of the existing pipeline.*

Response: The County's understanding is that the NPS 6 line is a smaller pipe, but with higher pressure. The County's understanding is that this will result in the same capacity being available as now, without any consideration for future population growth. County Council raised concerns with the decision to use the same capacity without consideration for future population growth. Although Enbridge ultimately did not satisfy County Council on this issue, or provide any meaningful information to administration for the County on this issue, capacity was agreed to by the County and not made a condition of approval for the project from the County.

Question b): *Please provide Essex County's understanding of the amount of capacity available from the replacement pipeline in comparison: b) to the incremental need of the hospital.*

Response: The County does not have any information related to the natural gas needs of the future hospital for which construction is being planned along County Road 42. Likewise the County does not have any information as to what consideration, if any, Enbridge gave to the needs of the future hospital in making its determination on the capacity of the pipeline.

Question c): *Please provide Essex County's understanding of the amount of capacity available from the replacement pipeline in comparison: c) to the incremental need of the hospital with other growth forecasted by the County.*

Response: The same as the response to 1 b) above.

Pollution Probe – Q # 2

Reference: Same as Q # 1 above.

Preamble: Same as Q # 1 above.

Question a): *Please provide all correspondence from EGI that addressed the specific incremental capacity of the pipeline beyond communication that cites simple statements as "like for like" and the capacity meets the EGI twenty year forecast. a) What is Essex's understanding of who would pay for a new pipeline if the replacement pipe had to be replaced in the next twenty years if the need to replace is due to capacity limitations?*

Answers of the Corporation of the County of Essex to the Interrogatories of FRPO
Page 3

Response: Enbridge has provided no correspondence to the County that addressed incremental capacity of the pipeline beyond simple statements that the capacity meets Enbridge's 20 year forecast.

It is the County's understanding that Enbridge or the ratepayers (if approved by the OEB) would bear the cost of a new pipeline if the need to replace is due to capacity limitations that Enbridge failed to account for, despite warnings from the County that the County believes the capacity estimates of Enbridge are flawed.

Dated: August 21, 2020

JOSEPHINE STARK
LSO # 24691J
DAVID M. SUNDIN
LSO # 60296N
McTAGUE LAW FIRM LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
455 Pelissier Street
Windsor, Ontario N9A 6Z9
(T) 519-255-4356
(F) 519-255-4384
(E) dsundin@mctaguelaw.com

LAWYERS FOR THE INTERVENOR,
THE CORPORATION OF THE COUNTY
OF ESSEX