ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Enbridge Gas Inc. ("**EGI**"), to review its 5-Year Natural Gas Supply Plan.

EB-2025-0065

INTERROGATORIES

OF

GINOOGAMING FIRST NATION

("GFN")

August 6, 2025

Question: **1-GFN-1**

Reference:
- The 5-Year Gas Supply Plan ("**GSP**") generally, and especially pages 5, 17 and 63-72

Preamble: Enbridge Gas Inc. ("**EGI**") serves over 3.9 million residential, commercial, and industrial customers across more than 300 municipalities and more than 20 First Nations throughout Ontario.

The GSP contains almost no references to First Nations or its Indigenous customers.

a) Please place Enbridge Inc.'s Indigenous Reconciliation Action Plan ("**IRAP**") and Indigenous Peoples Policy ("**IPP**") on the record.

b) Please confirm that the IRAP and IPP apply to EGI.

c) Did EGI engage and consult with any First Nations and/or First Nations customers in preparing the GSP?

If yes, please describe the engagement activities and indicate how the views of First Nations and First Nations customers informed the GSP.

If no, please explain why not and discuss whether EGI would support increased engagement with First Nations as part of the annual gas supply review process.

d) Did EGI present the GSP to the Indigenous Working Group? If it did, please provide particulars. If it did not, please explain why it did not.

e) Did EGI present elements of the GSP to the Indigenous Working Group? If it did, please provide particulars. If it did not, please explain why it did not.

f) Please describe how EGI has applied the principles, policies and commitments set out in the IRAP and IPP to the GSP.

g) Please provide specific comment on how each of the following items from the IRAP apply in the context of the current Application.

- Pillar 1 concerning people, employment and education
- Pillar 2 concerning community engagement and relationships
- Pillar 3 concerning economic inclusion and partnerships
- Pillar 4 concerning environmental stewardship and safety
- Pillar 5 concerning sustainability, reporting and energy transition

h) What are the impacts of the GSP on the cost of natural gas for First Nation reserve communities and off-reserve First Nation members? Why did EGI choose not to include this (or similar) information in the GSP?

Please include as part of your response the same information particular to Ginoogaming First Nation.

i) What are the impacts of the GSP on energy reliability and accessibility for First Nation reserve communities and off-reserve First Nation members? Why did EGI choose not to include this (or similar) information in the GSP?

Please include as part of your response the same information particular to Ginoogaming First Nation.

Question: **1-GFN-2**

Reference:
- EB-2024-0067, Consultation Transcript, pages 22-23
- Enbridge Inc.'s Indigenous Reconciliation Action Plan
- Enbridge Inc.'s Indigenous Peoples Policy

Preamble: At the Stakeholder Conference for EGI's 2024 Annual Update to its 5-Year Gas Supply Plan, EGI stated:

"The gas supply plan update does not have an impact on traditional lands or on Aboriginal and treaty rights, and, therefore, Enbridge Gas has not undertaken a consultation as it would in relation to an application for facilities that may have a potential impact on traditional lands or Aboriginal and treaty rights."

a) Does this remain EGI's position for the purposes of the current proceeding? If it does, please explain its rationale for the position that the GSP does not have an impact on traditional lands or on Aboriginal and treaty rights.

If it does not remain EGI's position, please explain how EGI's position has changed.

As part of your answer, please confirm whether EGI denies that EGI's operations in the traditional territories of First Nations have an ongoing impact on the lands and ecosystems, as well as the lives of community members, in those territories.

b) Assuming the above quotation remains EGI's position in this proceeding, please explain how the position is consistent with the principles of reconciliation. As part of your answer, please confirm the understanding (or definition) of reconciliation that EGI is using as the basis for its response.

c) Assuming the above quotation remains EGI's position in this proceeding, please explain how the position is consistent with the following statements:

- From Enbridge Inc.'s IPP, which states that "[c]ompanies can play a role in advancing reconciliation through meaningful engagement with and inclusion of Indigenous peoples and perspectives in their business activities" and that Enbridge will "seek the input and knowledge of Indigenous groups to identify and develop appropriate measures to avoid and/ or mitigate the impacts of [its] projects and operations that may occur on their traditional lands."

- From Enbridge Inc.'s IRAP, which states that "Enbridge understands meaningful engagement and respectful relationships are foundational to advancing reconciliation. [Enbridge is] committed to developing strategies, mechanisms and opportunities that support and nurture dialogue and engagement between Enbridge and Indigenous groups throughout the lifecycle of [its] projects and operations."

d) Does EGI agree that the GSP and subsequent annual updates would benefit from the inclusion of Indigenous consultation and perspectives throughout the process of developing these documents?

If it does, please elaborate on how EGI believes this should take place.

If it does not, please explain why not.

e) Does EGI agree that a requirement for EGI to engage with impacted First Nations on significant developments such as the energy transition would help to ensure that the concerns and perspectives of EGI's First Nations customers are identified? If not, please explain why not.

f) Does EGI agree that a requirement for EGI to engage with impacted First Nations on significant developments such as the energy transition would also increase the likelihood that any risks and opportunities are identified early, enabling EGI to take meaningful action when it is most cost-effective to do so? If not, please explain why not.

Question: **2-GFN-3**

Reference:
- GSP, pages 63-72
- Enbridge Inc.'s Indigenous Reconciliation Action Plan
- Enbridge Inc.'s Indigenous Peoples Policy
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Calls to Action

Preamble: The GSP's section on public policy contains no references to First Nations, Indigenous peoples, or reconciliation.

a) What criteria did EGI use to determine the subjects it would address in section 6 of the GSP, "Achieving Public Policy"? Please include any references to OEB guidance, policy or decisions that informed the criteria that EGI employed.

b) How does EGI define reconciliation? Does it understand reconciliation to be the following, as set out on page 2 of the IRAP: "ensuring that our future is increasingly inclusive and respectful of Indigenous rights, values and heritage, and in recognizing their vital role and contributions in shaping a more inclusive society"?

c) Does EGI recognize reconciliation to be, among other things, a public policy goal?

d) What is EGI's rationale for not addressing reconciliation in the GSP, whether in its public policy sections or elsewhere?

e) What is EGI's rationale for not investigating or identifying the concerns, perspectives and/or interests of First Nations and/or its Indigenous customers in the GSP, whether in its public policy sections or elsewhere?

f) Does EGI agree that its approach to the procurement of its gas supply could provide opportunities to advance reconciliation, if designed with the intention to do so?

g) Further to the question immediately above, please provide specific comment as to whether the procurement of EGI's gas supply could have an impact on the following priorities from the IRAP, including any reasons why the GSP could not have a positive impact on these items (if designed with the intention to produce a positive impact):

- Establishing flexible work placements and opportunities for Indigenous people (page 10), and increase Indigenous representation in Enbridge's permanent workforce (page 10);
- Explore and execute Indigenous commercial equity partnerships (page 19);
- Advance opportunities for Indigenous business to participate in Enbridge's supply chain (page 19);
- Advance Indigenous procurement spending (page 20);

Explore opportunities to remove contracting barriers and support Indigenous contractors (page 20).

h) Further to the question immediately above, please provide specific comment as to whether the procurement of EGI's gas supply (if designed with the intention to do so) could have an impact on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Call to Action #92 ("**CTA #92**"), which reads:

We call upon the corporate sector in Canada to adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a reconciliation framework and to apply its principles, norms, and standards to corporate policy and core operational activities involving Indigenous peoples and their lands and resources. This would include, but not be limited to, the following:

i. Commit to meaningful consultation, building respectful relationships, and obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous peoples before proceeding with economic development projects.

ii. Ensure that Aboriginal peoples have equitable access to jobs, training, and education opportunities in the corporate sector, and that Aboriginal communities gain long-term sustainable benefits from economic development projects.

i) Does Enbridge Inc.'s "recognition" of CTA #92[1] apply equally to EGI? If it does not, please explain why not. If it does, please explain what "recognition" of CTA #92 means for EGI.

[1] See IRAP at page 1. "Further, [the IRAP] is developed in recognition of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Call to Action #92…"

Question: **2-GFN-4**

Reference:
- GSP, page 66
- Ontario's Affordable Energy Future ("**OAEF**")[2]

Preamble: The GSP's policy section includes extensive references to the document Ontario's Affordable Energy Future, but it does not include the many references to support for Indigenous people that the document contains.

a) Does EGI agree that the OAEF's statements concerning Indigenous participation in Ontario's energy sector, and in particular the OAEF's section entitled "Indigenous Leadership and Participation", remain a current statement of the Ontario Government's priorities for Indigenous engagement in the sector?

b) Does EGI agree, to the best of its knowledge, that the following policy positions, which are set out in the OAEF,[3] remain the position of the Ontario Government:

- Early and meaningful engagement and consultation with Indigenous communities on energy planning and major energy projects is critical to building out our energy system;
- Energy procurements need to incorporate the value of Indigenous leadership and participation by building on existing incentives and engagement requirements;
- Indigenous representation is critical to ensuring there are Indigenous voices at the table on provincial energy matters.

In the event EGI does not agree, please elaborate on how it understands the Ontario Government's position to have evolved on these issues.

c) Please comment on the extent to which EGI believes its GSP could support the above priorities, if the GSP were designed with the intention to support them.

d) Please explain EGI's position on the extent to which EGI believes the OAEF's statements in support of increased Indigenous participation and leadership in Ontario's energy sector are relevant to the development of a gas supply plan in Ontario.

[2] Ontario's Affordable Energy Future: The Pressing Case for More Power | ontario.ca
[3] Ontario's Affordable Energy Future: The Pressing Case for More Power | ontario.ca at page 22.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS
6th day of August, 2025

Nicholas Daube
Counsel for GFN