EB-2021-0002

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Enbridge 2022-2027 DSM Plan and DSM Framework

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORIES
to
Environmental Defence (McDiarmid Evidence)

December 17, 2021

Submitted by: **Michael Brophy**

Michael Brophy Consulting Inc.

Michael.brophy@rogers.com

Phone: 647-330-1217

28 Macnaughton Road

Toronto, Ontario M4G 3H4

Consultant for Pollution Probe

Note: Format below is (ISSUE #)-(PARTY ACRONYM)-(Evidence Party)-(IR#)

1-PP-ED-1

Reference: “This electrified option reduces the potential for stranded gas infrastructure investments arising from the shrinking dependence on fossil fuels in a low carbon society.”

a) How should the OEB include the avoided cost of stranded assets as a benefit when assessing alternatives like DSM (e.g. an estimated percent of the Enbridge Asset Plan proposed spending)?

b) Over what period of time are the current gas assets likely to become stranded?

c) Even if technologies like electric heat pumps are more cost-effective than natural gas to new homes and communities, why is it Enbridge’s responsibility to promote those technologies in lieu of additional gas infrastructure?

2-PP-ED-2

The December 2021 IESO Annual Planning Outlook indicated an increase in natural gas generation and related GHG emissions. How will Ontarians benefit if end uses are electrified and electricity generation increases emissions through natural gas generation?

2-PP-ED-3

What barriers (if any) would need to be removed or requirements put in place in order for Enbridge Gas Distribution to deliver programs related to electric ASHPs and HWHPs that reduce/avoid natural gas use and also reduce electricity peaks for A/C?

5-PP-ED-4

What requirements should the OEB include in the DSM Framework or DSM decision to ensure that the best technology is promoted vs. a less beneficial technology (e.g. electric vs. gas heat pumps)?

5-PP-ED-5

Reference: “In many cases it is more cost effective to go all electric in lieu of installing new gas infrastructure for an existing community without gas service or to a new residential development”

The evidence indicates an average grant of $26,700 for Phase 2 of the Natural Gas Expansion Program. It is becoming more costly over time to reach new customers and communities including and additional proposed projects could include a subsidy of well over $130,000 per customer[1]. Please comments on this trend and how it impacts the recommendations in your report.

6-PP-ED-6

Reference:

Please explain how the stranding of a natural gas pipeline impacts gas Ratepayers and how that should be considered by the OEB for purposes such as DSM.

8-PP-ED-7

a) What incentive is there for Enbridge to support electric AHSPs or related measures over gas capital expansion?

b) What requirements are needed to ensure that the best options are identified and pursued?

10-PP-ED-8

Please provide the TRC Plus test results and assumptions for the hybrid heating system scenario analyzed in the McDiarmid report.

[1] Example from: EB-2019-0255 EGI Batch 4_Part 1_REDACTED_20201118

10-PP-ED-9

a) Please summarize the net benefits of installing an ASHP or HPHW vs. the comparable natural gas options.

b) Is an ASHP or HPHW costs effective using the TRC Plus test? If yes, please provide the estimated TRC Plus calculations.

16-PP-ED-10

If hybrid heating with electric heat pumps where there is a gas furnace is recommended as an interim measure, when should this be reassessed (i.e. in this five year plan or the next)?