

**ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING PROPOSAL
EB-2020-0091**

UNDERTAKING (J)

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
J1.1	10/2	TO PROVIDE THE LONGEST-TERM PEAKING SERVICE THAT ENBRIDGE/UNION GAS HAS ACTUALLY BID FOR.	18/2
J1.2		TO ADVISE WHETHER THERE IS TYPICALLY A PAYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH DISPLACEMENT	
J1.3		TO PROVIDE THE EVIDENTIARY OR TRANSCRIPT REFERENCE TO A PROCESS FOR STAKEHOLDERS TO RAISE ALTERNATE IRPAS AND HAVE THEM CONSIDERED AND ADDRESSED	
J1.4		TO PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF WHAT'S MEANT BY THE FIRST SENTENCE IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF FRPO 15	
J1.5		TO ADVISE THE BEST TIME TO SCREEN OUT IRPAS BEFORE A LEAVE-TO-CONSTRUCT APPLICATION	
J1.6		TO ADVISE WHETHER IRPAS ARE IN SCOPE WITHIN A REBASING PROCEEDING	
J1.7		TO PROVIDE A PROPOSAL OR WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS ARE IF THE BOARD AGREES THAT THERE SHOULD BE ADJUDICATION OF THOSE KINDS OF IRP DECISIONS TO CHOOSE PIPE OVER NON-PIPE FOR PROJECTS BELOW THE LEAVE-TO-CONSTRUCT THRESHOLD WHERE THAT WOULD BE ADJUDICATED	
J1.8		TO CONFIRM WHETHER THE 20-YEAR PLAN HAS BEEN PROVIDED, AND IN WHAT FUTURE	

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
		PROCEEDING IT MIGHT BE PROVIDED	
J1.9		TO PROVIDE A FORECAST FOR ANNUAL CONSUMPTION BY NEW ADDITIONAL CUSTOMERS 2020-2030.	
J1.10		TO ADVISE WHETHER AN IRP ANALYSIS HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN, WHETHER IRP ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN SCREENED OUT, AND WHETHER THE PROJECT IS DRIVEN ALL OR IN PART BY FORECAST DEMAND GROWTH	
J1.11		TO PROVIDE WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WOULD BE PROVIDED IN THE AMP SPECIFICALLY IF AN IRPA IS CHOSEN, AND WHAT SPECIFIC INFORMATION WILL NOW BE SHOWN IN FUTURE AMPS WHERE YOU'VE NOT SELECTED IN IRP AND YOU HAVE GONE FOR A FACILITIES	
J1.12		TO PROVIDE WHATEVER INFORMATION OF ANY KIND OF RANGES, MAXIMUM FOR THE DIFFERENT SECTORS, FOR RESIDENTIAL VERSUS GENERAL SERVICE.	
J1.13		TO CONFIRM THE AGE OF THE FORECASTS IN TABLE 1	
J.14		TO PROVIDE AMP DATA 10 YEARS OUT, IF AVAILABLE, OR SHORTER PERIODS, AS AVAILABLE	
J1.15		TO PROVIDE WHATEVER DOCUMENT WOULD HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO MAKE THEM AWARE OF THIS APPLICATION.	
J1.16		TO MAKE BEST EFFORTS TO PROVIDE IRP SCREENING DOCUMENTATION	
J1.17		TO DESCRIBE THE EXACT NATURE OF THE LEAVE TO NOT CONSTRUCT, THE NON-PIPELINE ALTERNATIVE TO BE SOUGHT AND	

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
		THE LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY	
DAY 2			
J2.1	11/2	(A) TO PROVIDE NUMBERS FOR THE ENBRIDGE GAS DISTRIBUTION TERRITORY IN RELATION TO THE UPDATED RESPONSE TO FRPO 49. (B) TO RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTION: WITH THE DECREASE IN INTERRUPTIBLE LOAD SEEN HERE AND EXPECTED IN THE EGD RATE ZONE, IS IT TIME TO REVIEW IF THE INTERRUPTIBLE RATES HAVE SUFFICIENT ECONOMIC INCENTIVE TO BE USEFUL AS DEMAND RESPONSE IN THE IRP FRAMEWORK?	18/2
J2.2		TO PROVIDE AN UPDATED AND REVISED VERSION OF IR STAFF 20 WITH MORE DETAIL FOR AVOIDED COMMODITY-FUEL COSTS AND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS	
J2.3		TO INDICATE WHEN THE DEPRECIATION STUDIES FOR LEGACY UTILITIES WERE LAST FILED	
J2.4		TO PROVIDE A LIST OF PROJECTS WHERE NON-PIPE SOLUTIONS WERE SCREENED OUT, AND FOR EACH, TO SHOW WHETHER AVOIDED COSTS WERE INCLUDED IN THE COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS	
J2.5		TO PROVIDE A PROPOSED FORMULA TO DETERMINE ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR ENBRIDGE WHERE THE IRPA IS SIGNIFICANTLY CHEAPER THAN THE FACILITY SOLUTION.	
J2.6		TO PROVIDE ENBRIDGE'S POSITION AS TO WHETHER THE FRAMEWORK SHOULD REQUIRE IT TO PURSUE PROJECTS SIMILAR TO THE ONE DESCRIBED IN EP 17, WHERE	

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
		THEY ARE FEASIBLE AND COST-EFFECTIVE	
J2.7		TO PROVIDE ANY AND ALL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS TO SUPPORT THE EXCLUSION OF NON-PIPELINE ALTERNATIVES OR IRPAS IN COMMUNITY EXPANSION PROJECTS.	
J2.8		TO GIVE ENBRIDGE'S VIEW ON WHETHER IT SHOULD INCLUDE THE IMPACT OF TAX IMPACTS ON CUSTOMERS AS PART OF STAGE 2	
J2.9		TO PROVIDE A TEMPLATE THAT WORKS WITH BOTH FACILITIES AND NON-FACILITIES AND MIXES OF FACILITIES AND NON-FACILITIES.	
J2.10		(A) TO PROVIDE IN-FRANCHISE CUSTOMERS A HUNDRED PERCENT SHIELDED FROM THE COSTS AND RISKS OF PIPE INVESTMENTS NEEDED, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, TO SERVE EX-FRANCHISE DEMAND; (B) IF DEMAND FROM EX-FRANCHISE CUSTOMERS IS ULTIMATELY LOWER THAN FORECAST, DO YOUR ARRANGEMENTS WITH EX-FRANCHISE CUSTOMERS REQUIRE THEM TO STILL PAY FOR THEIR ORIGINAL SHARE OF THE COST OF SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT OVER THE FULL PERIOD OVER WHICH THE COSTS ARE TO BE RECOVERED	
J2.11		TO CLARIFY THE PROPORTION OF IDENTIFIED PROJECTS WHICH WILL NOW FALL UNDER THE INCREASED LTC THRESHOLD, BY PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS AND PERCENTAGE OF CAPITAL SPENDING	
J2.12		TO PROVIDE DETAILS OF THE STEPS OR THE ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE FOUR-YEAR TIMELINE THAT IT WILL TAKE ENBRIDGE TO DESIGN, PLAN, SEEK OEB APPROVAL FOR, AND CONSTRUCT AN LTC FACILITIES	

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
		PROJECT	
J2.13		TO PROVIDE ENBRIDGE'S POSITION ON WHAT CAPITAL COST TREATMENT OR CAPITAL COST TREATMENT WOULD BE APPLIED TO SUPPLY SIDE IRPAS THAT DELAY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS, ON THE SIMPLE BASIS OF A 10-MILLION-DOLLAR REVENUE REQUIREMENT IRPA OR A 20-MILLION-DOLLAR REVENUE REQUIREMENT CAPITAL COST.	
J2.14		TO ADVISE AS TO WHETHER ANY CHANGES NEED TO BE MADE TO PARAGRAPH 74 OF EXHIBIT B TO REFLECT WHAT'S SET OUT IN IR STAFF 22; TO CLARIFY AS NECESSARY	
J2.15		TO PROVIDE AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS THAT ENBRIDGE WOULD USE TO COMPARE A HYPOTHETICAL TRANSMISSION PROJECT WITH AN ALTERNATIVE WHERE A DEMAND RESPONSE PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED THAT DECREASES THE SIZE OF THE TRANSMISSION PROJECT BY 20 PERCENT	
J2.16		TO INFORM US HOW MORE DETAIL ON HOW RISKS WOULD BE ADDRESSED DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE BASELINE AND IRPAS, SUCH AS RISK TOOLS AND WHAT TOOLS MIGHT THEY USE	
J2.17		TO ADVISE WHETHER ENBRIDGE HAS ANY INTERNAL PLANNING METRICS FOR AMP THAT MIGHT BE APPLICABLE TO IRP.	
DAY 3			
J3.1	12/2	TO EXPLAIN HOW, IF AT ALL, WERE EACH OF THE COMMITMENTS SET OUT IN THE BULLETS IN THE ENBRIDGE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES POLICY CONSIDERED OR APPLIED IN THE FORMATION OF ENBRIDGE'S IRP PROPOSAL, BROKEN DOWN BY BULLET	18/2

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
		POINT	
J3.2		TO EXPLAIN HOW EACH BULLET IN ENBRIDGE'S IRP PROPOSAL IS REFLECTED IN THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK	
J3.3		TO ADVISE HOW THEY ARE INTENDED TO BE APPLIED IF THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK IS APPROVED.	
J3.4		TO ADVISE AS TO WHETHER ENBRIDGE HAS AN UPDATED EXPECTATION OR FORECAST AS TO WHAT PERCENTAGE OF ITS PROJECTS WOULD BE CONDUCTIVE TO IRP, AND WHETHER DIRECTIONALLY IT IS ANTICIPATED TO BE HIGHER OR LOWER THAN THE 14 TO 17 PERCENT THRESHOLD.	
J3.5		TO CONFIRM WHETHER THE IRP PROPOSAL IS INTENDED TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE ENBRIDGE NEW ESG GOALS	
J3.6		TO PROVIDE ICF DOCUMENTATION ABOUT THE CENTRAL HUDSON PROGRAM.	
J3.7		TO ADVISE IF THERE WERE ANY FIRST NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE ADVISORY GROUP RELATED TO ICF'S 2018 IRP STUDY.	
J3.8		TO ADVISE THE CARBON COST INCLUDED IN IFC'S APPLICATION OF THE 2016 CONSERVATION POTENTIAL TO ITS STUDY	
J3.9		TO ITEMIZE THE AREAS WHERE ONTARIO MIGHT BE SEEN AS LAGGING IN COMPARISON WITH NEW YORK STATE WITH RESPECT TO DERS, ENERGY EFFICIENCY, AND DECARBONIZATION.	
J3.10 A		TO PROVIDE A LIST OF THE INPUTS FOR THE TRC-PLUS TEST	

<u>Undertaking</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>Response Date</u>
J3.10 B		TO HIGHLIGHT THE DIFFERENCES AS THEY ARE IN THE TABLE AND PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION, PARTICULARLY ON THE DISCOUNT RATES THAT WOULD BE USED FOR EACH OF THE THREE APPROACHES.	

**ENBRIDGE GAS INC.
INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING PROPOSAL
EB-2020-0091**

EXHIBIT (K) LIST

K-EXHIBITS

<u>EXHIBIT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
-----------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

NO EXHIBITS WERE FILED DURING THE
TECHNICAL CONFERENCE.