

**From:** [David Stevens](#)  
**To:** [drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com)  
**Cc:** "[Richard Wathy](#)"; "[Lawrie Gluck](#)"; "[mark](#)"; "[Mondrow, Ian](#)"  
**Subject:** RE: EB-2025-0065 ISSUES CONFERENCE  
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 2:30:32 PM

---

Thank you, Dwayne.

Enbridge Gas does not think that an additional issue is required. We acknowledge that questions about whether Enbridge Gas considered whether purchasing a portion of planned gas supply for the winter season as fixed price supply for winter delivery in advance (up to during the previous summer season) would be appropriate and more cost-effective than current practices are in scope. These questions would fit under either or both of Issues 1 and 2(b).

We are agreeable to you sharing this email chain with parties in advance of tomorrow's Issues Conference as confirmation that the three items that you have noted generally fit within existing issues.

Dave

**David Stevens**

Partner

T 416.865.7783  
E [dstevens@airdberlis.com](mailto:dstevens@airdberlis.com)

**Aird & Berlis LLP** | Lawyers

Toronto | Vancouver

Aird & Berlis LLP operates as a multi-disciplinary practice.

This email is intended only for the individual or entity named in the message. Please let us know if you have received this email in error. If you did receive this email in error, the information in this email may be confidential and must not be disclosed to anyone.

---

**From:** [drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com) <[drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com)>  
**Sent:** July 19, 2025 11:45 PM  
**To:** David Stevens <[dstevens@airdberlis.com](mailto:dstevens@airdberlis.com)>  
**Cc:** 'Richard Wathy' <[richard.wathy@enbridge.com](mailto:richard.wathy@enbridge.com)>; 'Lawrie Gluck' <[lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca](mailto:lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca)>; 'mark' <[mark@shepherdruenstein.com](mailto:mark@shepherdruenstein.com)>; 'Mondrow, Ian' <[lan.Mondrow@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:lan.Mondrow@gowlingwlg.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: EB-2025-0065 ISSUES CONFERENCE

Hi David and Richard.\_Thank you for taking the time to respond yesterday allowing some communication with my colleagues prior to responding. As usual, their interest in this issue combined with their simplifying of the issue allows us to advance some clarity around the issue and, perhaps, the opportunity to agree on its inclusion as a separate issue or acknowledgement that the outstanding concern is covered. If we can get agreement/acknowledgement, we propose that this email get the broader distribution to stakeholders and staff for everyone's awareness and likely a shorter issues conference.

For the first two issues, we accept items can be subsumed as noted in your response, so I

think we have agreement.

To clarify on the third issue, we are not asking that EGI be directed to execute a prescribed strategy. What we are seeking is that the Board be given the opportunity to understand the options as they exist for EGI at the time of choosing, not in hindsight. The following simple summary, provided by a colleague, captures our concern with a re-stated issue for your consideration:

The basic assertion that we have been trying to pursue is;

*Buying more gas (a percentage of the forecasted need not all i.e., a portfolio approach) at a fixed price in the summer for winter delivery could be more cost effective than buying spot gas to meet peak demand in the winter or buying delivered gas in the summer and using more storage.*

Evaluation of this premise would entail comparing:

1. The total cost of summer delivered purchases plus storage.
2. The cost of summer purchases of winter delivered gas; and
3. The cost of spot gas purchases at the time of peak demand.

Revised proposed wording for the issues list would be:

*Has Enbridge Gas considered whether buying more gas at a fixed price in the summer for winter delivery could be more cost effective than buying spot gas to meet peak demand in the winter or buying delivered gas in the summer and using more storage.*

With what we hope is improved clarity on our interest, the above wording could be a separate issue (subject to improved and agreed-upon wording) or EGI could inform its acceptance of the interest with recommendation of the issue under which the interest falls.

Thank you for continuing to work with us to achieve an agreed upon issues list in an efficient and effective manner.

Dwayne Quinn  
Principal  
DR QUINN & ASSOCIATES LTD.  
519-500-1022

---

**From:** David Stevens <[dstevens@airdberlis.com](mailto:dstevens@airdberlis.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 1:15 PM

**To:** [drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com)

**Cc:** Richard Wathy <[richard.wathy@enbridge.com](mailto:richard.wathy@enbridge.com)>; 'Lawrie Gluck' <[lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca](mailto:lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca)>; 'mark' <[mark@shepherdrubenstein.com](mailto:mark@shepherdrubenstein.com)>

**Subject:** RE: EB-2025-0065 ISSUES CONFERENCE

Hello Dwayne.

Thank you very much for sending these proposed additional issues to us for early consideration.

Generally speaking, Enbridge Gas acknowledges that the substance of what is included in FRPO's proposed additional issues is within scope for the 5 Year Gas Supply Plan proceeding. However, we do not think that additional issues are needed.

Here are our specific responses.

**Is the basis for quantifying transportation choices appropriate?**

- To the extent that this additional issue is asking whether Enbridge Gas has properly and fully justified its transportation contracting decisions, then this is something that fits squarely within the proposed issues #1 & 2. The examination and consideration of contracting decisions will presumably be looked at in the context of whether they meet the OEB's gas supply guiding principles (Issue 1) and in the context of whether Enbridge Gas has appropriately presented a supply option analysis (Issue 2).
- To the extent that FRPO is proposing that Enbridge Gas should be presenting different information in the future, this would fit within proposed Issue 7.

**Does the GSP fully address the opportunities of integrating supply-side IRP?**

- To the extent that this additional issue is asking whether the 5 Year Gas Supply Plan is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the consideration of supply side IRPAs that may be appropriate, then this would fit within proposed issues #1 & 2.
- To the extent that this additional issue is asking whether Enbridge Gas is meeting the OEB's expectations from the EB-2024-0067 (2024 GSP Update) to provide discussion and description of potential facilities benefits that could result from gas supply contracting, then that would fit within proposed issue #5.
- To the extent that this additional issue is going further, and asking whether the 5 Year Gas Supply Plan is proactively considering supply side IRPAs, then Enbridge Gas does not agree that this is appropriate. As has been discussed previously, Gas Supply does not initiate supply side IRPAs, this is initiated by other planning groups and then supported by the gas supply planning function.

**Should EGI be purchasing some of its load balancing gas months or a year or two in advance to mitigate risk on its portfolio of load balancing?**

- Assuming that this issue is asking whether Enbridge Gas should be considering whether to purchase load balancing gas in advance, then this fits within Issues 1 & 2. The examination and consideration of load balancing plans will

presumably be looked at in the context of whether they meet the OEB's gas supply guiding principles (Issue 1) and in the context of whether Enbridge Gas has appropriately presented a supply option analysis and risk mitigation analysis (Issue 2).

- Enbridge Gas does not agree that the outcomes from this proceeding would include directions as to what Enbridge Gas must do (as opposed to must consider) in terms of execution, but that seems like an item for argument rather than for the issues list.

We hope that the confirmations above will give you sufficient explanation and comfort that the issues list as proposed by Enbridge Gas will accommodate the additional items that FRPO is planning to discuss during the proceeding.

Dave

**David Stevens**

Partner

T 416.865.7783

E [dstevens@airdberlis.com](mailto:dstevens@airdberlis.com)

**Aird & Berlis LLP** | Lawyers

Toronto | Vancouver

Aird & Berlis LLP operates as a multi-disciplinary practice.

This email is intended only for the individual or entity named in the message. Please let us know if you have received this email in error. If you did receive this email in error, the information in this email may be confidential and must not be disclosed to anyone.

---

**From:** [drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com) <[drquinn@rogers.com](mailto:drquinn@rogers.com)>

**Sent:** July 17, 2025 12:44 AM

**To:** David Stevens <[dstevens@airdberlis.com](mailto:dstevens@airdberlis.com)>

**Cc:** 'Joel Denomy' <[Joel.Denomy@enbridge.com](mailto:Joel.Denomy@enbridge.com)>; 'Lawrie Gluck' <[lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca](mailto:lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca)>; 'mark' <[mark@shepherdhubenstein.com](mailto:mark@shepherdhubenstein.com)>

**Subject:** EB-2025-0065 ISSUES CONFERENCE

Hi David and Joel.

David, per our conversation today and after some consideration and consultation, in the spirit of efficiency, I am advancing FRPO's proposed additions to EGI's list submitted with the application.

I would sincerely appreciate if you could provide us with EGI's response regarding the company's views on these proposed additions by Monday so that we can determine our investment in the conference. If EGI were to accept our proposals, FRPO may not need to attend.

I have limited the distribution of this email but, if appropriate, could expand it depending on EGI's response.

Dwayne Quinn  
Principal  
DR QUINN & ASSOCIATES LTD.  
519-500-1022