

Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Patent and Trade-mark Agents

www.fasken.com

333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Bay Adelaide Centre, Box 20
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 2T6

416 366 8381 Telephone
416 364 7813 Facsimile
1 800 268 8424 Toll free



John A. Campion
Direct 416.865.4357
jcampion@fasken.com

DELIVERED and SERVED

RECEIVED

December 10, 2014

DEC 15 2014

Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4

Attention: Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary

Torys Law Firm LLP
79 Wellington Street West, 30th Floor
Box 270, TD South Tower
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1N2

Attention: Crawford Smith

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Dear Sirs / Mesdames:

Re: Natural Resource Gas Limited (“NRG”)

**Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Divisional Court) – Court File No.: 521/14
Filing of Appeal Record and Motion for a Stay (Divisional Court Appeal)**

**NRG QRAM – Phase 2 Proceeding -- EB-2014-0053
Motion for Consolidation with EB-2014-0154**

**Union Gas Limited (“Union”) Penalty Rate Hearing – EB-2014-0154
Motion to Review Decision and Order of October 9, 2014
Motion for Consolidation with EB-2014-0053**

Introduction:

Enclosed with this letter are the Appeal Book and Compendium and the Exhibit Book served pursuant to the *Rules of Civil Procedure* in the Divisional Court Appeal. Also enclosed is a Motion Record containing a Notice of Motion and supporting Affidavit material seeking, *inter alia*, a stay of the Divisional Court Appeal pending a decision by the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) in NRG’s request for a review of the Board Decision and Order in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing.

Also enclosed with this letter is a Notice of Motion and supporting Affidavit in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing seeking a review of the Board’s Decision and Order made on October 9, 2014 and, if a review is granted, an Order that the re-hearing of the matter be consolidated with the hearing of Phase II of the NRG QRAM hearing.

- 2 -

Finally, enclosed is a Notice of Motion and supporting Affidavit material in the Phase II proceeding of the NRG QRAM hearing seeking consolidation of this hearing with the review of the Board's Decision in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing, if granted.

NRG relies upon the evidence, Decision and Order of the Board and other materials contained in the Appeal Book and Compendium and Exhibit Book filed with the Divisional Court in the motions described below.

Divisional Court Appeal Motion

The motion for a stay of the appeal can be properly dealt with on consent if the Board and Union are so advised. I therefore enclose a Consent Order in the Divisional Court appeal for your consideration. If both parties are willing to consent, would you please approve the draft Order. I will thereafter file the Consent Order with the Court thereby eliminating the need for the Board or Union to file materials or appear on the motion for a stay.

Union Penalty Rate Hearing – Request for Review and Other Relief

From the Notice of Motion filed, NRG is seeking:

- (a) a review of the Board's Decision and Order dated October 9, 2014 in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing (EB-2014-0154). NRG relies upon Rule 40.01 of the *Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Board* ("Rules") in requesting the Board review its final Order and Decision and vary the final Order and Decision directing that NRG pay only Union's cost of gas (\$7.12 per GJ) for 25,496 GJ delivered by Union to NRG's account on February 28, 2014. NRG also relies upon Rule 7.01, extending the time limit contained in Rule 40.03. In seeking a review of the Board's Decision, NRG relies upon the new evidence and opinions delivered by consultants and witnesses put forward by the Board and Union in its 2014 Natural Gas Market Review Stakeholder Conference on December 3 and 4, 2014 and described by Brian Lippold in his Affidavit of December 8, 2014, filed about the causes of the unprecedented cost of gas delivered at the Dawn hub of Union;
- (b) NRG also relies upon Rule 42.01 of the Rules setting out the grounds for a review of a Board decision. NRG relies upon "... new facts that have arisen ..." and "... facts that were not previously placed in evidence in the proceeding and could not have been discovered by reasonable diligence at the time ...". In particular, NRG relies upon paragraphs 8 to 17 of the Affidavit of Brian Lippold, filed and Exhibits "A" to "E", inclusive, attached to that Affidavit. The facts, analysis and opinion given by consultants retained by the Board and Union could not have been discovered and placed before the Board until after the reports had been delivered in December 2014, some seven weeks after the Board had made its final Decision and Order on October 9,

- 3 -

2014. While the facts and opinions are numerous within the consultant's reports and slide presentations, NRG emphasizes the following evidence given by the Board consultant, Navigant, regarding the extreme natural gas price perturbations in January and February 2014: "... there were many events unfolding in real time last winter as market participants made decisions on planning and acquiring supply. The most important event was the cold weather, which was widespread, persistent and extreme. Hindsight allows all the information to be seen at once ...". Of significance in the new facts which became available at the December Review, was the list of contributing factors contained in paragraph 12 of the Affidavit of Brian Lippold. It is now apparent that Union's purchases in the market to re-fill its storage and market events in the United States of America caused the very high prices that feed the formula contained in the penalty rate calculation that Union has imposed upon NRG. In effect, Union was competing with NRG at the same time that NRG was seeking assistance to find reasonably priced natural gas in February 2014. Union was obliged to tell NRG of this fact, but did not. In any event, Union obtains a windfall in the price differential between its cost of gas and the penalty rate. In short, Union customers receive a benefit while NRG customers suffer a detriment. Having regard to all of the new facts, including Union's evidence of major purchases in the natural gas market in February and all of the other factors that were not known or could have been known either in February 2014 or prior to their disclosure in December 2014, it is respectfully submitted that NRG should be granted a review of the Board's Decision and Order of October 9, 2014;

- (c) by letter dated December 1, 2014, NRG sought relief from and a stay of the imposition of interest amounts allegedly due from NRG to Union for payment of certain winter checkpoint banked gas purchases. NRG proffered a payment of \$205,130.62 for the 25,496 GJ of natural gas. The amount offered was based on Union's average weighted cost of spot purchases as at February 28, 2014, being \$7.12 per GJ plus HST. The Board has not given any direction or decision regarding this request. NRG asks that this issue be heard and decided at the same time as the other issues, as set out above;
- (d) in the Phase II Proceeding of the NRG QRAM hearing (EB-2014-0053), the Board is required to deal with NRG's prudence in purchasing natural gas during January and February 2014. The outcome of that decision will be affected by the new evidence, facts and opinions dealt with in the Lippold Affidavit, filed. NRG requests that the issues arising in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing be consolidated with the issues arising in the NRG QRAM Hearing as they are all affected by the new evidence, facts and opinions filed with the Affidavit of Brian Lippold; and

- 4 -

- (e) NRG requests an oral hearing to deal with all of the factual and expert evidence now placed on the record by the Board itself and by Union.

NRG requests direction from the Board to deal with the request for review and ancillary relief. As set out above, NRG requests an oral hearing after Union has had an opportunity to file its own evidence. NRG requests that written interrogatories be permitted after all Affidavit evidence has been received, and that oral argument follow that process. In any event, NRG asks that a witness from Union be made available for cross-examination before the Board.


NRG QRAM – Phase II Proceeding (EB-2014-0053)

NRG has requested a decision and order of the Board regarding the treatment of NRG's cost of gas during the winter season 2013/2014. In particular, NRG has asked that the cost of gas be declared a cost of ratepayers. The Board has directed a prudence review. NRG has sought an oral hearing. NRG was granted a right to receive the Board consultant's reports as part of the NRG QRAM Phase II Proceeding.

In that the new evidence contained in the Affidavit of Brian Lippold filed in EB-2014-0154, the Union Penalty Rate Hearing, also impacts the NRG QRAM hearing, NRG seeks permission to rely upon the Affidavit of Brian Lippold and the consultant's reports and evidence attached thereto in the NRG QRAM hearing.

NRG therefore seeks an order of the Board consolidating the NRG QRAM hearing with the issues outstanding in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing so as to obtain the "... most just, expeditious, and efficient determination on the merits of all of the proceedings presently extant before the Board ..." pursuant to Rule 2.01 of the Rules. In this regard, NRG relies upon Rule 4.01 in seeking a procedural order consistent with the requests made above.

Yours very truly,


John A. Champion

JAC/car

Enclosures

cc: Lawrie Gluck, Ontario Energy Board
Brian Lippold, Natural Resource Gas Limited
Laurie O'Meara, Natural Resource Gas Limited
Robert Hutton, Natural Resource Gas Limited

(cover letter only)

Court File No. 521/14

(Ontario Energy Board)
File No. EB-2014-0154

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(DIVISIONAL COURT)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF a Decision and Order of the Ontario Energy Board dated October 9, 2014 on the Application by Union Gas Limited for an order or orders approving a one-time exemption from Union Gas Limited's approved rate schedules to reduce certain penalty charges applied to direct purchase customers who did not meet their contractual obligations;

AND IN THE MATTER OF the Intervenor – Natural Resource Gas Limited

B E T W E E N:

NATURAL RESOURCE GAS LIMITED

Moving Party/Appellant

- and -

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD and UNION GAS LIMITED

Respondents

CONSENT

THE PARTIES to this action hereby consent to an order in the form attached as Schedule "A" hereto.

The parties certify that the order being consented to does not affect the rights of any person under a disability, as defined by Rule 1.03 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.

Date: December ____, 2014

John A. Campion
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Lawyers for Natural Resource Gas Ltd.

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
The Ontario Energy Board

Crawford G. Smith
Torys LLP
Lawyers for Union Gas Limited

SCHEDULE "A"

Court File No. 521/14

(Ontario Energy Board)
File No. EB-2014-0154

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(DIVISIONAL COURT)**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF a Decision and Order of the Ontario Energy Board dated October 9, 2014 on the Application by Union Gas Limited for an order or orders approving a one-time exemption from Union Gas Limited's approved rate schedules to reduce certain penalty charges applied to direct purchase customers who did not meet their contractual obligations;

AND IN THE MATTER OF the Intervenor – Natural Resource Gas Limited

B E T W E E N:

NATURAL RESOURCE GAS LIMITED

Moving Party/Appellant

- and -

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD and UNION GAS LIMITED

Respondents

ORDER

THIS MOTION made by the appellant was read this day at Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the Consent of the parties, filed:

1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the time to perfect this appeal is hereby extended until 30 days after the Ontario Energy Board (the “**Board**”) has finally decided the appellant Natural Resource Gas Limited’s motion for a review of the Board’s Decision and Order dated October 9, 2014.

2. THIS COURT FURTHER ORDERS that there shall be no costs of this motion.

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF a hearing of the Ontario Energy Board on its own motion in order to determine the Application by Union Gas Limited for an order or orders approving a one-time exemption from Union Gas Limited's approved rate schedules to reduce certain penalty charges applied to direct purchase customers who did not meet their contractual obligations.

Court File No. 521/14

(Ontario Energy Board)
File No. EB-2014-0154

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(DIVISIONAL COURT)**

ORDER

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP

333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Bay Adelaide Centre, Box 20
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2T6

John A. Champion / Jennifer McAleer

Tel: 416.865.4357 / 416 865 4413

Fax: 416 364.7813

Email: jcampion@fasken.com / jmcaleer@fasken.com

**Lawyers for the Moving Party/Appellant,
Natural Resource Gas Limited**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF a hearing of the Ontario Energy Board on its own motion in order to determine the Application by Union Gas Limited for an order or orders approving a one-time exemption from Union Gas Limited's approved rate schedules to reduce certain penalty charges applied to direct purchase customers who did not meet their contractual obligations.

Court File No. 521/14

(Ontario Energy Board)
File No. EB-2014-0154

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(DIVISIONAL COURT)**

CONSENT

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP

333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Bay Adelaide Centre, Box 20
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2T6

John A. Champion / Jennifer McAleer

Tel: 416.865.4357 / 416 865 4413

Fax: 416 364.7813

Email: jcampion@fasken.com / jmcaleer@fasken.com

**Lawyers for the Moving Party/Appellant,
Natural Resource Gas Limited**

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF requested Board Directions for consolidation of the hearing before the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) of the NRG QRAM Phase II Proceeding in Board Matter EB-2014-0053 together with the hearing of the Union Penalty Rate Hearing (EB-2014-0154)

B E T W E E N:

NATURAL RESOURCE GAS LIMITED

Moving Party/Appellant

- and -

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD and UNION GAS LIMITED

Respondents

NOTICE OF MOTION

Natural Resource Gas Limited (“NRG”) hereby makes a motion to the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) requesting, *inter alia*, certain directions regarding the process to be followed on the hearing of the NRG QRAM Hearing.

PROPOSED METHOD OF HEARING:

NRG requests that the motion be heard orally, subject to direction of the Board.

THE MOTION IS FOR:

1. A Direction that the oral or other hearing of the NRG QRAM Hearing be consolidated to be heard together with the Union Penalty Rate Hearing and further Direction as may be necessary.
2. Such further and other relief as this Honourable Court may deem just.

THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:

1. NRG has discovered new evidence, facts and expert opinions that were not available and could not have been previously placed in evidence in the hearing of this matter before the Board, and could not have been discovered by reasonable diligence up to the time the Board made its Decision and Order on October 9, 2014;
2. The new evidence, facts and expert opinions are cogent, relevant to the outcome of the Union Penalty Rate Hearing and the NRG QRAM Hearing, and could not have been discovered with more diligence up to the time that the new evidence was presented to the public on December 3 and 4, 2014;
3. The issues arising in the Union Penalty Rate Hearing and the NRG QRAM Hearing are sufficiently intertwined that the two matters should be consolidated and heard together in order that the Board secure the most just, expeditious and efficient determination of both matters on their merits pursuant to Rule 2.01 of the Rules.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE will be used at the hearing of the motion:

1. The Affidavit of Brian Lippold sworn December 8, 2014; and
2. Such further and other evidence as counsel may advise and this Board may permit.

December 9, 2014

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP

Barristers and Solicitors
333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Bay Adelaide Centre, Box 20
Toronto, ON M5H 2T6

John A. Champion (LSUC# 14121C)

Tel: 416.865 4357
Email: jcampion@fasken.com
Fax: 416 364 7813

Lawyers for Moving Party/Appellant,
Natural Resource Gas Ltd.

TO: ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Kirsten Walli

Tel: 416 440 7677
Email: kirsten.walli@ontarioenergyboard.ca
Fax: 416 440 7656

Board Secretary for Respondent, The Ontario Energy Board

AND TO: TORYS LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
79 Wellington St. W., 30th Floor
Box 270, TD South Tower
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1N2 Canada

Crawford G. Smith
Tel: 416 865 8209
Email: csmith@torys.com
Fax: 416 865 7380

Lawyers for the Respondent, Union Gas Limited

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF requested Board Directions for consolidation of the hearing before the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) of the NRG QRAM Phase II Proceeding in Board Matter EB-2014-0053 together with the hearing of the Union Penalty Rate Hearing (EB-2014-0154)

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

NOTICE OF MOTION

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP

333 Bay Street, Suite 2400
Bay Adelaide Centre, Box 20
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2T6

John A. Champion

Tel: 416.865.4357
Fax: 416 364.7813
Email: jcampion@fasken.com

**Lawyers for the Moving Party/Appellant,
Natural Resource Gas Limited**