

VIA RESS

January 11, 2023

Ontario Energy Board
Attn: Ms. Nancy Marconi, OEB Registrar
27th Floor, 2300 Yonge Street,
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

RE: EB-2022-0203 EGI Ridge Landfill – FRPO Comments

We are writing on behalf of the Federation of Rental-housing Providers of Ontario (FRPO) with regard to EGI's Reply Argument submitted January 9th in the above proceeding. In particular, FRPO is concerned with the assertions regarding our approach and to express concern over the information presented in response to our submissions.¹

EGI has asserted that FRPO "inappropriately ignores the OEB-established procedure" in providing our submissions. Respectfully to the Ontario Energy Board (OEB or the Board), our intent was to the contrary by providing the Board with information and considerations that the company did not provide. Moreover, in our desire to ensure that the OEB was duly informed, we requested that EGI file their analysis in response to the factors that we identified and estimated as a plausible alternative.²

In our first interrogatory, we asked EGI to provide information on pipelines in the area and their assessment of these pipes as alternatives. Beyond the map, EGI did not provide the requested data; only a statement that these pipes were "considered."³ Without this data, FRPO used our experience and publicly available information, most from past EGI/Union Gas filings, to demonstrate there was a plausible alternative which EGI ought to have considered. EGI states that the alternative was considered "as part of Enbridge Gas's feasibility analysis." It is disconcerting that this feasibility analysis was not filed in evidence nor were pertinent aspects of that analysis filed in response to our inquiry in FRPO.1.

Further, in the stated reasoning for dismissing our plausible alternative, EGI distinguishes that the main limitation to accessing the surrounding markets was that other sections of the Ridgetown pipeline are rated for a lower operating pressure limiting the maximum pressure of the Ridgetown Line. A comparison of the two maps distinguished in their footnote 19 does show a branch that travels south coming off of the Ridgetown Line. The colour code indicates that the line is a 1900 kPa pipeline that feeds Shrewsbury and area as opposed to the 3450 kPa of the Ridgetown Line.

However, in our experienced opinion, this distinction does not make sense as, in accordance with the pipeline code CSA Z662, pipe segments of different Maximum Operating Pressure must be separated by an above ground valve in a station. A check of our resources reveals that EGI has Station 06J-202 near the junction of the Ridgetown Line and the Shrewsbury connection which, in our view, would serve such a purpose thus eliminating the constraint

¹ EGI_ReplySUB_EB-2022-0203_20230109, para. 26-28

² FRPO_SUB_RIDGE LANDFILL_20221216, pg. 5

³ Exhibit I.FRPO.1

identified by EGI. With this station controlling the pressure to a maximum of 1900 kPa, EGI could operate the Ridgetown Line at the higher pressure thus accessing the significant and growing load in the neighbouring pipelines.⁴

While we firmly believe that our submissions will assist the Board, in retrospect, we do respect that we should have appealed to the OEB for more fulsome interrogatory responses and/or a technical conference to follow a more traditional approach. FRPO would expect that the applicant in a Leave to Construct proceeding would file sufficient evidence on the evaluation of alternatives to inform the Board and potentially reduce the steps required to complete the record. However, given this experience, we will strive to request a Technical Conference for Leave to Construct matters for which the prefiled evidence inclines us to believe that the public interest would be served better with two stages of discovery.

We trust that the Board understands our intent and respects whatever weight the panel ascribes to our submissions.

Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of FRPO,

Dwayne R. Quinn
Principal
DR QUINN & ASSOCIATES LTD.

c. B. Zimmer, EGI Regulatory Proceedings – EGI
C. Nguyen, M. Millar – Staff
Interested Parties – EB-2022-0203

⁴ In the EB-2018-0188 application, on page 7, Union Gas evidence states that the forecasted growth prompting their request for pipeline reinforcement would take the current demand from 16,000 m³/hr to a forecasted demand of 35,000 m³/hr by 2025. This forecasted **hourly** demand represents approximately one-quarter of the **daily** supply of 140,000 m³ of RNG from the Ridge Landfill.