



Patricia Squires
Manager
Regulatory Applications – Leave to
Construct
Regulatory Affairs

Tel: (416) 753-6284
Email: Patricia.squires@enbridge.com
EGIRegulatoryProceedings@enbridge.com

Enbridge Gas Inc.
500 Consumers Road
North York, ON
M2J 1P8

October 28, 2024

BY RESS AND EMAIL

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

Dear Nancy Marconi:

**Re: Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas or the Company)
Ontario Energy Board (OEB) File: EB-2024-0200
St. Laurent Pipeline Replacement Project
Technical Conference – External Expert Consultants**

This is in response to the letter earlier today from Environmental Defence, requesting that representatives of outside expert consultants Posterity and Integral attend the technical conference taking place on October 30 and 31 in this proceeding.

In its October 16 letter ED first briefly raised this topic and asked that representatives of those consultants attend the technical conference. On October 18 Enbridge Gas responded and indicated that it did not see the need for, and was therefore not planning to ask those consultants, to attend the technical conference, and we provided specific reasons for this position. ED then chose to not respond until today. It waited a full 10 days before indicating it was still pursuing this point, which is two days before the technical conference. It is unfair and impractical for ED to proceed this way. For the reasons summarized below, Enbridge Gas submits the OEB should not entertain making the order ED is now seeking.

First, for reasons outlined in our October 18 letter, there should be no need for representatives of Posterity or Integral to attend the technical conference. Without reiterating each of those points, it is important to highlight that, as expressly set out in Procedural Order # 2, this technical conference is “for parties to ask clarification questions related to interrogatory responses”. Out of all the interrogatories, there were only two that were responses directly from Posterity, and there were zero responses directly from Integral. So we would not expect there to be any response clarification questions for Integral itself, and only very limited questions that could properly be for Posterity. If there are any such questions, they could easily and efficiently be dealt with by way of written undertaking responses. And the OEB’s rules of course require that any such undertakings be fully answered.

Second, ED's letter today says it wants the consultants to attend so there can be "a full and adequate testing of the expert evidence," and suggests that perhaps there are additional interrogatories ED chose not to ask. Respectfully, what ED is suggesting goes beyond the proper scope of this technical conference. ED had a full opportunity to ask whatever interrogatories it wanted, including for Posterity and Integral. If ED chose not to ask various interrogatories, that was up to it. The technical conference is not the time to ask new interrogatories.

Third, with ED having waited 10 days to respond on this issue, Enbridge Gas assumed ED was no longer pursuing its request in light of the points we made in our October 18 letter. As a practical matter, there would not now be sufficient time to try to make arrangements for these consultants to attend (if they are even available) and permit them time to properly prepare in any event. It is unfair to these consultants (and to Enbridge Gas) for ED to have waited until today to request this order.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Patricia Squires

Patricia Squires
Manager, Regulatory Applications – Leave to Construct