REF: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 2, pg. 3 including Table 1 and EB-2020-0134 Exhibit I.FRPO.26, Attachment 1

Preamble: EGI evidence provides:

"The increase in the total bill is a factor of the QRAM price increases and other approved rate changes effective October 1, 2021 including: the addition of the 2019 deferral and variance account disposition and the 2019 DSM deferral and variance account disposition impacts."

We would like to understand the impact of the proposed changes on a wholistic basis including other dispositions.

- 1) Please provide a matrixed table showing all of the respective proposed, pending, and approved dispositions for each of general rate classes by month starting October 1, 2021 through September 20, 2022 similar to FRPO. 26 referenced above.
 - i) Please show the duration of the disposition through each month to allow an understanding of wholistic bill impact.
 - ii) Please provide a total impact at the bottom of each column representing the individual rate zones.

REF: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 2, pg. 5

Preamble: We would like to understand the source of the PGVA Rate Mitigation Credits

- 2) What is the source of the funds that will providing the respective Credits?
- 3) Please provide any past precedents where EGI or its legacy companies used such a system for rate mitigation.
 - a) Did EGI consider other rate change mitigation measures including lengthening the recovery period?
 - i) For each mitigation alternative, please describe why it was not proposed.

REF: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 2, pg. 7

Preamble: We would like to understand how EGI intends to communicate the nature of this mitigation and the impact on customer bills.

- 4) Please provide the key messages that EGI intends to communicate in the respective communication channels specifically Enbridgegas.com and IVR.
 - a) Please provide the FAQ questions and responses that will be provided.

i) IF these FAQ's are not available at the time of response to these questions, please indicate if EGI would provide this information to the Board, its call centre and to interested stakeholders in rates proceedings.
(1) If not, why not including what is EGI alternative plan?

REF: Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 1, pg. 2-3, Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1 and Exhibit C, Tab 4, Schedule 3, pg. 1

Preamble: EGI evidence provides in the first reference:

"For rate design purposes within the EGD rate zone, Enbridge Gas uses the Empress reference price inclusive of fuel to determine the variable unit rate for costing its commodity purchases and receipts. The change in the Empress reference price from July 1, 2021 (\$116.3153 /10³m³) to October 1, 2021 (\$147.1678/10³m³) is an increase of \$30.5525/10³m³. These costs are recovered from system gas customers in the EGD rate zone through the gas supply commodity charge which will increase from 11.8074 ¢/m³ to 14.9222¢/m³ for the October 1, 2021 QRAM. As stated above, the total PGVA reference price increased by \$38.618/10³m³. Given that the Empress reference price increased by \$30.5525/10³m³, the basis differential between the PGVA and Empress reference price has increased which results in an increase in transportation and load balancing related cost."

We would like to understand the equity associated with applying basis differential increases to the transportation cost borne by customers especially those who purchase their own commodity.

- 5) Please confirm that EGI did not experience any transportation increase to the EGD Rate zone as depicted in the second above reference.
- 6) Please confirm that EGI is proposing an 11.8% increase in the Gas Supply Transportation rate in the third reference.
- 7) Will that Transportation increase be visited upon direct purchase customers who provide their gas at the Empress delivery point?
 - a) If so, if EGI transportation rates have not gone up, how is it equitable for direct purchase customers to pay a rate increase that is a result of EGD rate zone ratemaking that uses Empress as a reference price. Please explain in detail.