

June 12, 2024

BY EMAIL AND FILED VIA RESS

Nancy Marconi
Registrar
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Marconi:

**Re: Enbridge Gas Inc. (“Enbridge Gas”, or the “Company”)
EB-2024-0111 – 2024 Rebasing and IRM – Phase 2
Enbridge Gas submissions re Intervenor Evidence Proposals**

We represent Enbridge Gas.

In response to Procedural Order No. 2, several parties (OEB staff, Environmental Defence (ED) and HRAI) filed letters with the OEB about evidence that they propose to file in this case.

In general, Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed intervenor evidence. However, the Company does have two brief submissions in response.

First, where appropriate, the Company requests the opportunity to respond to new proposals and information included in the intervenor evidence.

From the letters that have been filed, it appears that the proposed evidence sponsored by OEB Staff and ED goes beyond what is currently on the record, and (among other things) will likely include some new proposals related to the Incentive Rate Mechanism (IRM) that will set the Company's rates for 2025 – 2028.

The letter from OEB staff indicates that its expert (PEG) may include alternative proposals and recommendations for an IRM as part of its report. The first letter from ED indicates that its experts (Current Energy Group) would recommend adjustments to the proposed IRM related to “capital cost containment” and “the need to adjust utility incentives in order to safeguard customer interests in light of the energy transition ...”. The second letter from ED indicates that its experts (Energy Futures Group) would provide comments on a number of aspects of Enbridge Gas's evidence, including the low-carbon energy proposal, system pruning/IRP and the ETTF. It is not clear whether this evidence would include new proposals.

Enbridge Gas requests that the Company be provided with the opportunity to respond to new proposals and information included in the expert evidence sponsored by intervenors, either through written expert evidence or through written reply evidence from Enbridge Gas witnesses. In order to maintain the schedule set out in Procedural Order No. 2, Enbridge Gas proposes that it would file any such further evidence by the start of the Settlement Conference (September 10th).

Second, the Company requests that the OEB make clear that the intervenor-sponsored evidence be confined to the matters at issue in this proceeding.

It is not clear that all of the proposed intervenor evidence from HRAI is relevant to the Issues List for this proceeding. The letter from HRAI's counsel indicates that part of their evidence may address how HVAC suppliers operate in a competitive market, including how they find out about, evaluate and cost, and bid on new projects. Enbridge Gas does not believe that this is relevant to the clearly defined Issue #27 approved by the OEB ("Has Enbridge Gas demonstrated that Enbridge Sustain's activities are not funded through rates?").

Enbridge Gas requests that the OEB direct that HRAI's evidence be limited to items that are responsive to Issue #27.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP



David Stevens

c: all parties in EB-2024-0111