



Evan Tomek
Senior Advisor
Regulatory Applications - LTC
Regulatory Affairs

Tel: (226) 229-9598
Evan.tomek@enbridge.com
EGIRegulatoryProceedings@enbridge.com

Enbridge Gas Inc.
3840 Rhodes Drive
P.O. Box 700
Windsor, ON N9A 6N7
Canada

September 18, 2025

VIA RESS AND EMAIL

Ritchie Murray
Acting Registrar
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ritchie Murray:

**Re: Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas)
Ontario Energy Board (OEB) File: EB-2025-0073
Mississauga Reinforcement Project
Reply Submissions**

In accordance with Procedural Order No. 1, please find attached Enbridge Gas's Reply Submissions in the above-noted proceeding.

Sincerely,

Evan Tomek

Evan Tomek
Senior Advisor, Regulatory Applications – Leave to Construct

c.c. Tania Persad (Enbridge Gas Counsel)
Arend Wakeford (Enbridge Gas Counsel)
Judith Fernandes (OEB Case Manager)
James Sidlofsky (OEB Counsel)
Amanda Montgomery (Elson Advocacy)
Kent Elson (Elson Advocacy)
Ian Mondrow (Gowling WLP (Canada) LLP) (Industrial Gas Users Association Counsel)

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*,
S.O. 1998, c. 15, Schedule B; and in particular section 90(1)
and section 97 thereof;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas
Inc. for an order granting leave to construct natural gas
pipelines in the Town of Oakville and the City of Mississauga.

ENBRIDGE GAS INC.

REPLY SUBMISSION

Table of Contents

A. Introduction.....	2
B. Project Need.....	4
C. Project Alternatives	6
D. Project Cost & Economics.....	11
E. Environmental Impacts	13
F. Landowner Impacts	14
G. Indigenous Consultation.....	15
H. Conditions of Approval	18
I. Conclusion	18

A. Introduction

1. Pursuant to Procedural Order No. 1 issued by the Ontario Energy Board (“OEB”) on July 24, 2025, this is the reply submission of Enbridge Gas Inc. (“Enbridge Gas” or “Company”) in respect of its application to the OEB under section 90(1) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (“OEB Act”) for an order granting leave to construct approximately 3.1 km of Nominal Pipe Size (“NPS”) 6-inch steel natural gas main with a design pressure of 1,900 kPa in the Town of Oakville and the City of Mississauga, Ontario to service Petro-Canada Lubricants Inc., CRH Canada Group Inc., and CertainTeed Canada Inc., (“Customers”) with their new requested contract parameters with Enbridge Gas.
2. In addition to the proposed pipeline, the following ancillary facilities¹ are also proposed to accommodate the Customers’ request for natural gas service:²
 - Rebuild of the existing natural gas customer station on Petro-Canada Lubricants Inc.’s property, including full telemetry;
 - Rebuild of the existing natural gas customer station on CRH Canada Group Inc.’s property, including full telemetry;
 - A new NPS 6-inch steel natural gas service at a maximum operating pressure of 1,900 kPa to the rebuilt CRH Canada Group Inc. customer station; and
 - A new natural gas district regulating station and approximately 20 m of NPS 4-inch steel natural gas main.
3. The Project has a profitability index of 1.17 and will not result in additional costs borne by existing ratepayers as Enbridge Gas has executed long-term firm

¹ Enbridge Gas is not seeking approvals from the OEB to construct the ancillary facilities.

² Together, the proposed pipeline and ancillary facilities are referred to as the “Project.”

service contracts with the Customers to fully fund the cost of the Project as follows, with all contracts effective December 1, 2026:

- Rate 115 contract with Petro-Canada Lubricants Inc.;
 - Rate 110 contract with CRH Canada Group Inc.; and
 - Rate 110 contract with CertainTeed Canada Inc.
4. With the necessary approvals of the OEB, Enbridge Gas expects to construct the Project between April and November 2026 to meet the Customers' service start date of December 1, 2026, as per the executed contracts. To meet the proposed Project construction timelines, Enbridge Gas respectfully requests approval of the Application by December 2025.
5. Submissions on the evidence in this proceeding were filed by OEB staff, the Industrial Gas Users Association ("IGUA"), and Environmental Defence ("ED").
6. OEB staff expressed full support for approval of the Project:³

OEB staff supports the approval of Enbridge Gas's leave to construct application subject to the OEB's standard conditions of approval for natural gas leave to construct applications. OEB staff also supports the approval of the forms of land-use agreements proposed by Enbridge Gas.⁴

7. IGUA also expressed full support for approval of the Project⁵ and highlighted the following:

³ OEB staff recommends that in the event that a letter from the Ministry of Energy and Mines confirming the sufficiency of Enbridge Gas's Indigenous consultation activities is not received before an OEB decision is made, the OEB may consider placing the proceeding in abeyance until such time that the letter is filed. (OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 11).

⁴ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 3.

⁵ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 2.

The proposed expansion supports Petro-Canada Lubricants Inc. (PCLI's) decarbonization and other emission reduction initiatives, while respecting the beneficiary pays principle. These are two broader principles which IGUA has consistently supported.⁶

8. ED acknowledged that the Project meets the cost-effectiveness tests set out in E.B.O 188 and that ED's "preferred alternatives" cannot be implemented in time to meet the increased customer demand.⁷ ED, in its submission, did not express that it is opposed to the Project but asked the OEB in approving the Project, to not expressly condone Enbridge Gas declining to explore the following issues:

- Whether Integrated Resource Planning Alternatives (IRPAs) could have achieved ratepayer savings through downsizing or deferral; and
- Whether pipes that are compatible with 100% hydrogen should be utilized where the project serves hard-to-decarbonize industrial customers.⁸

9. Through the balance of this submission, Enbridge Gas highlights the submissions of OEB staff and IGUA supporting the Project and responds to the specific submissions and recommendations of OEB staff, IGUA, and ED. Enbridge Gas also highlights and responds to the specific submissions and recommendations of ED that are out of scope of this proceeding and should not be considered by the OEB.

B. Project Need

10. Enbridge Gas has demonstrated the need for the Project based on the following:
- i. Enbridge Gas has executed long-term firm service contracts with the Customers to fully fund the cost of the Project, effective December 1,

⁶ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 1.

⁷ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 1.

⁸ Ibid.

2026.⁹ The contracts contain provisions that ensure the Customers pay for the capacity required and the cost of providing their service¹⁰;

- ii. A review of natural gas consumption for the network to which the Customers are connected was completed considering the incremental firm service bids from the Customers. The review identified a system pressure shortfall on design-day indicating the system would be operating below minimum design requirements with the Customers' request for incremental natural gas service. Therefore, a system reinforcement is required to maintain the system at its minimum pressure;¹¹
- iii. The additional firm natural gas capacity provided by the Project will allow Petro-Canada Lubricants Inc. to eliminate the use of heavy fuel oil/bunker oil in compliance with new sulphur dioxide emissions regulations (outlined in O. Reg. 88/22) that take effect on January 1, 2027;¹²
- iv. The Project is designed to meet the needs of the Customers and is not dependent on any future or previously filed leave to construct application by Enbridge Gas¹³; and
- v. The Project is supported by multiple municipalities and various local associations, including the City of Mississauga, Peel Region, Mississauga Board of Trade, Oakville Chamber of Commerce, Owenwood Residents Association, Rattray March Protection Association, Park Royal Community Association, and the Walden Spinney Community.¹⁴

⁹ Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 12.

¹⁰ Exhibit I.STAFF-4, part c).

¹¹ Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 7.

¹² Exhibit I.STAFF-2, part a).

¹³ Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 9.

¹⁴ Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachments 4 – 11.

11. OEB staff, in its submission, affirmed that Enbridge Gas established the need for the Project:

OEB staff submits that Enbridge Gas has established the need for the Project.¹⁵

12. IGUA also acknowledged that Enbridge Gas established the need for the Project in their submission:

The record supporting this project indicates that:

1. The project is requested, and will be fully funded, by the 3 customers (including PCLI) for whom it is being built to serve.
 2. The use of incremental natural gas by these customers provides environmental benefits through displacement of less environmentally friendly fuel. In PCLI's case, switching to natural gas is specifically required in accord with PCLI's plan to comply with pending SO² emission limits and to reduce GHG and particulate emissions.¹⁶
13. ED did not make submissions specific to the Project need; however, they did acknowledge the following:

Enbridge has demonstrated that the identified gas demand is best addressed by the proposed project as there is not sufficient time to explore the Integrated Resource Planning Alternatives (IRPA) or to explore alternatives pipeline materials before the identified demand materializes.¹⁷

C. Project Alternatives

14. On the issue of Project alternatives, Enbridge Gas considered the need to assess the viability of Integrated Resource Planning ("IRP") alternatives to providing built capacity to deliver gas. Through the proper application of the Binary Screening Criteria, the Company determined that the Project falls under

¹⁵ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 4.

¹⁶ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 1.

¹⁷ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 1.

the definition of “customer-specific builds” in the IRP Framework approved by the OEB and therefore an IRP evaluation is not required.¹⁸

15. Additionally, the evidence demonstrates that the proposed route is the most feasible option to meet the Project need. Enbridge Gas described its consideration of a number of facility alternatives for the Project:
- Rebuild of an existing Enbridge Gas distribution station at the northeast quadrant of the Winston Churchill Boulevard and Royal Windsor Drive intersection; and
 - Installation of a new natural gas pipeline within the municipal road allowance which included three pipeline routing options (Preliminary Preferred Route, Alternative Route 1, and Alternative Route 2) which are discussed in greater detail in the Environmental Report (ER).¹⁹
16. A third alternative route (Alternative Route 3) was also described in section 4.4. of the ER in the event that the CRH Canada Group Inc. customer station could not be rebuilt within its existing footprint; however, it was determined that the customer station could be rebuilt within its existing footprint and therefore Alternative Route 3 was not subject to further evaluation.²⁰
17. Enbridge Gas assessed alternatives based on established assessment criteria with consideration of economic feasibility, timing, safety & reliability, risk management and environmental & socio-economic impact.²¹
18. A rebuild of the existing station at the northeast quadrant of the Winston Churchill Boulevard and Royal Windsor Drive intersection would be sufficient to meet the Project need. However, the station was constructed in the municipal road allowance, and it is not feasible to expand the station at its current location due to limited space within the road allowance and adjacent landowners being unwilling

¹⁸ Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 6.

¹⁹ Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 2.

²⁰ Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 3.

²¹ Exhibit I.ED-2, part a).

to sell their property to Enbridge Gas, based on outreach conducted by Enbridge Gas.²²

19. Alternative Routes 1 and 2 included the construction of a new distribution station in either the Town of Oakville or City of Mississauga to replace the existing distribution station located at the Winston Churchill Boulevard and Royal Windsor Drive intersection; however, Enbridge Gas would be required to purchase land for the new distribution station and after extensive outreach, it was determined that no suitable parcels of land were available to be purchased and therefore Alternative Routes 1 and 2 were deemed not feasible.²³ Additionally, Enbridge Gas was aware of a property in the area being investigated has sold recently for over \$9 million. Excluding the cost to construct pipelines to connect the new distribution station, this land cost, combined with the \$8.7 million estimate in direct capital costs for the new station, would have made these alternatives more expensive than the proposed Project at approximately \$17.7 million.²⁴
20. Enbridge Gas submits that the Project need is best addressed by the proposed Project, and that the Company has adequately considered all viable alternatives.
21. OEB staff agrees with Enbridge Gas that the Project represents the best alternative to meet the Project need:

Based on Enbridge Gas's evidence, OEB staff submits that the Project is the best alternative to meet the stated need and that the proposed route is acceptable.²⁵

22. Even ED acknowledged that the proposed Project best addressed the Project need, albeit in a misinformed manner. That is, ED stated:

Enbridge has demonstrated that the identified gas demand is best addressed by the proposed project as there is not sufficient time to explore Integrated Resource Planning

²² Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 4.

²³ Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 1, para. 5.

²⁴ Exhibit I.ED-2, part a).

²⁵ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 5.

Alternatives (IRPA) or to explore alternatives pipeline materials before the identified demand materializes.²⁶

23. While acknowledging that the proposed Project best addresses the Project need, ED incorrectly asserts that there was not sufficient time to explore IRPAs. As explained in paragraph 14 above, Enbridge Gas properly applied the Binary Screening Criteria and determined that the Project falls under the definition of “customer-specific builds” in the IRP Framework approved by the OEB and therefore an IRP evaluation was not required.
24. The OEB should disregard ED’s submission that the OEB, in approving the project, not expressly condone Enbridge Gas declining to explore issues related to whether IRPAs could have achieved ratepayer savings through downsizing or deferral.²⁷ This would be akin to the OEB determining that Enbridge Gas did not follow the IRP Framework, which of course is not the case.
25. ED further disregards the IRP Framework in its submission essentially seeking to impose an IRP assessment obligation whenever the project economics are underpinned by long-term contracts.²⁸ This conflicts with the IRP Framework, which is clear that projects such as this are excluded from IRP evaluation particularly in the case of customer-specific builds where customer(s) fully pay for the incremental infrastructure costs associated with a facility project through either the choice to pay a contribution in aid of construction or to contract for long-term firm services delivered by such facilities.²⁹ A review of the IRP Framework Binary Screening Criteria (and consideration of new criteria) is well outside the scope of the current proceeding.

²⁶ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 1.

²⁷ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 1.

²⁸ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 2.

²⁹ EB-2020-0091 (Appendix A) IRP Framework for Enbridge Gas, p. 10.

26. Furthermore, ED's suggestion that there may be lost benefits³⁰ are without merit. There are no hypothetical lost benefits of reducing the costs added to rate base as projects underpinned by long-term contracts will have no cost impact on existing ratepayers. As stated by IGUA in its submission, the Project will be fully paid for by the customers who have requested it, on the basis of their own economic assessments of such costs and alternatives thereto for meeting their emissions compliance obligations and aspirations.³¹
27. ED's additional comments about likelihood of benefits arising from various customer project scenarios³² ignores that the customers who are driving the Project have confirmed their required demands are inclusive of all future expected natural gas conservation activities³³. Further, it would be inappropriate for ratepayers to fund an IRP alternative seeking to meet the customers' needs where the facility alternative would otherwise be fully funded by the customer. In the event a customer-specific build contributed to an upstream reinforcement that would benefit a larger project area with a financial impact to existing ratepayers, that broader reinforcement project would be subject to IRP assessment, in accordance with the IRP Framework.
28. Likewise, ED's request that the OEB not explicitly condone Enbridge Gas declining to examine whether pipes that are compatible with 100% hydrogen should be utilized where a project serves hard-to-decarbonize industrial customers³⁴ is also out of scope and should be disregarded. In response to Exhibit I.ED-3, Enbridge Gas provided a detailed explanation regarding its selection of pipeline materials and why other pipeline materials, including those capable of carrying 100% hydrogen, were not feasible and also not relevant to this proceeding.

³⁰ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 2.

³¹ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 2.

³² ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 2.

³³ Exhibit I.STAFF-3, part c).

³⁴ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 1.

29. As stated by IGUA:

The proposed project will be fully paid for by the customers who have requested it, on the basis of their own economic assessments of such costs and alternatives thereto for meeting their emissions compliance obligations and aspirations.

In respect of future proofing the project to accommodate the future use of hydrogen, EGI essentially indicated that such considerations in this application are premature, given the ongoing Hydrogen Blending Study directed by the OEB in the Phase 1 rebasing decision. As EGI as indicated, which is consistent with IGUA's understanding and that of its members, both the availability and affordability of hydrogen remain practical impediments to hydrogen fuel or process input adoption, even where hydrogen is technically substitutable in support of an industrial process.³⁵

30. Enbridge Gas confirmed it is currently undertaking a full evaluation of its natural gas grid in Ontario under the Hydrogen Blending Grid Study ("Grid Study"). The Grid Study is ongoing and will evaluate the major aspects of the natural gas grid system's readiness to accept natural gas and will better inform Enbridge Gas on the approximate cost implications for projects with future hydrogen readiness provision.³⁶

31. Even more fundamentally, however, is the fact that the Customers asked for natural gas service and the OEB currently has no jurisdiction to regulate 100% hydrogen pipelines.

D. Project Costs & Economics

32. On the issue of Project costs and economics, Enbridge Gas explained that the total cost of the Project is estimated to be approximately \$18.97 million. An economic analysis has been completed in accordance with the OEB's recommendations in its E.B.O 188 Report of the Board on Natural Gas System

³⁵ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 2.

³⁶ Exhibit I.ED-3, parts b) – c).

Expansion (“EBO 188”). The Project has a Net Present Value (“NPV”) of \$2,545,670 and a profitability index (“PI”) of 1.17.

33. As discussed in the Project Need section above, Enbridge Gas has executed long-term firm service contracts³⁷ with the Customers to fully fund the cost of the Project, effective December 1, 2026. In response to an OEB staff interrogatory³⁸, Enbridge Gas clarified that the contracts contain provisions that ensure the Customers pay for the capacity required and the cost of providing their service, and the Company used conservative revenue terms in the contracts ranging from 2 to 9 years based on the length of the contract terms coinciding with the length of time in which cost recovery is achieved. Additionally, Enbridge Gas included a 25% contingency in the cost estimate to cover any unforeseen cost changes and expects that the Customers will continue to require natural gas capacity beyond their respective contract terms which will result in additional revenues beyond cost estimates for the Project.³⁹
34. OEB staff has no concerns with Project costs and economics:
- OEB staff has no concerns with the recovery of the Project costs based on Enbridge Gas’s evidence that it has executed long-term service contracts with the customers to fully fund the Project and that there will be no cost impact on existing ratepayers.⁴⁰
35. IGUA in its submission, acknowledges that the project is requested, and will be fully funded, by the Customers for whom it is being built to serve which respects the beneficiary pays principle which IGUA has consistently supported.⁴¹
36. ED in its submission, acknowledges that the project economics meet the OEB’s economic test outlined in EBO 188.⁴² ED’s other comments regarding a

³⁷ Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachments 12 – 14.

³⁸ Exhibit I.STAFF-4.

³⁹ Exhibit I. STAFF-4, part a).

⁴⁰ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 6.

⁴¹ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 1.

⁴² ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 2.

suggested review of EBO 188 are inappropriate for a leave to construct proceeding such as this and should be completely disregarded. Even ED acknowledges that a panel hearing a leave to construct application does not have the jurisdiction to order that a generic hearing or consultation take place on EBO 188.⁴³

37. Enbridge Gas submits that the evidence in this proceeding demonstrates that Project costs are reasonable and that the Project is economically feasible as it is fully funded by the Customers and will not result in additional costs borne by existing ratepayers.

E. Environmental Impacts

38. On the issue of environmental impacts, OEB staff states:

OEB staff submits that Enbridge Gas has completed the ER in accordance with the OEB's *Environmental Guidelines for the Location, Construction and Operation of Hydrocarbon Pipelines and Facilities in Ontario 8th Edition* (Environmental Guidelines).

OEB staff has no concerns with the environmental aspects of the Project, based on Enbridge Gas's commitment to implement the mitigation measures set out in the ER.

OEB staff submits that Enbridge Gas's compliance with the OEB's standard conditions of approval for natural gas leave to construct projects will ensure that impacts of pipeline construction are mitigated and monitored. OEB staff notes that the conditions of approval also require Enbridge Gas to obtain all necessary approvals, permits, licences, and certificates needed to construct, operate and maintain the Project.⁴⁴

39. IGUA did not make any submissions specific to the ER completed for the Project; except to tie in how emissions reductions can be beneficial for large volume customers, stating:

As IGUA has consistently advocated, in the case of large volume industrial gas customers the adoption or expansion of natural gas as a fuel source and/or process input

⁴³ ED Submission, September 3, 2025, p. 3.

⁴⁴ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, pp. 7-8.

is often a cost effective decarbonization/emission reduction strategy. In such cases, *increasing* gas use can *decrease* environmentally harmful emissions, while controlling or even reducing input costs for these trade exposed industrials.⁴⁵

40. ED did not make any submissions related to the environmental aspects of the Project.
41. Enbridge Gas submits that it has appropriately completed the ER in accordance with the OEB's Environmental Guidelines. Furthermore, Enbridge Gas is prepared to implement the mitigation measures set out in the ER and all the recommendations and directives identified by the Ontario Pipeline Coordinating Committee review.
42. Enbridge Gas submits that it will obtain all necessary approvals, permits, licences, and certificates needed to construct, operate, and maintain the Project.
43. Enbridge Gas believes that, by following its standard construction practices and adhering to the recommendations and mitigation measures identified in the ER and additional measures provided by Indigenous communities and regulatory agencies through the permitting and approval process, the construction of the Project will have negligible impacts on the environment. The cumulative effects assessment completed as part of the ER also indicated that provided the mitigation and protective measures outlined in the ER are implemented and that concurrent projects implement similar mitigation and protective measures, potential cumulative effects are not anticipated to occur, or if they do occur are not anticipated to be significant.⁴⁶

F. Landowner Impacts

44. Regarding potential landowner impacts, intervenors and OEB staff raised no issues related to the Project. OEB staff submitted that:

⁴⁵ IGUA Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 1.

⁴⁶ Exhibit F, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 1, p. 121.

... the OEB should approve the proposed forms of easement agreement and temporary working area agreement as both were previously approved by the OEB. Furthermore, the Project is planned to be constructed within the municipal ROW, similar to the Ridge Landfill RNG Project.⁴⁷

G. Indigenous Consultation

45. The Ministry of Energy and Mines (“MEM” or the “Ministry”) delegated the procedural aspects of consultation to Enbridge Gas and specifically outlined expectations in relation to consultation to be undertaken, including that a low level of consultation was owed to three of the identified Indigenous groups (Huron-Wendat Nation (“HWN”), Six Nations of the Grand River Elected Council (“SNGR”), and Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council) and a moderate level of consultation was owed to the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation (“MCFN”).⁴⁸ Enbridge Gas implemented its Project consultation in a manner that has met or exceeded the requirements identified in the MEM’s Delegation Letter. In accordance with the OEB’s Environmental Guidelines, an Indigenous Consultation Report (“ICR”) outlining Enbridge Gas’s consultation activities in relation to the Project has been prepared and provided to MEM and filed with the OEB.⁴⁹
46. Enbridge Gas implemented a consultation program with each of the Indigenous groups identified in the MEM’s Delegation Letter, which involved: providing Project notification to the four Indigenous groups identified by MEM as being potentially impacted by the Project early on in Project development; offering capacity funding to each Nation; sharing information including maps of the Project location, information regarding routes and the ER; inviting each Nation to share comments and information, including information about any Indigenous rights practiced in the Project area; and responding to any expressed concerns

⁴⁷ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 8.

⁴⁸ Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 3.

⁴⁹ Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachments 6 and 7; Exhibit I.STAFF-10, Attachments 1 and 2.

and explaining how those concerns would be addressed, through mitigation or otherwise, moving forward.

47. OEB staff submitted that the updated ICR⁵⁰ demonstrates Enbridge Gas's efforts to address concerns raised by MCFN, SNGR, and HWN.⁵¹ In response to questions raised by the MCFN, Enbridge Gas explained that the Project work should not interfere with phragmites given its location in a road allowance and committed that equipment would be cleaned prior to leaving the site if construction was within the proximity to phragmites. Enbridge Gas further committed to notifying MCFN of reportable spills and inviting the Nation to a post-construction walk-through of site conditions. Similarly, Enbridge Gas responded to comments from HWN regarding the timing of Stage 2 Archaeological Assessments generally and SNGR with respect to the route selection process, the scope and nature of the environmental assessment, including the studies completed to date, and how the ER provides a comprehensive guide to mitigation measures.⁵²
48. Regarding the Haudenosaunee Development Institute ("HDI"), OEB staff submitted that it would be helpful for Enbridge Gas to provide any additional information in its reply submission reflecting its attempts to schedule meetings with HDI, as noted in its interrogatory responses, and any other efforts it has undertaken with respect to consultation with HDI regarding the Project.⁵³ To this effect, after HDI cancelled a meeting with Enbridge Gas representatives in October 2024 and advised it would be rescheduled to re-establish discussions regarding HDI's concerns with all Enbridge Gas assets in HDI's traditional territory⁵⁴, Enbridge Gas reached out to HDI on October 24, 2024 to re-schedule the meeting. The request to reschedule the meeting with HDI has gone

⁵⁰ Exhibit I.STAFF-10, Attachment 2.

⁵¹ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 10.

⁵² Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachments 6 and 7; Exhibit I.STAFF-10, Attachments 1 and 2.

⁵³ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, pp. 10-11.

⁵⁴ Exhibit I.STAFF-11, part b).

unanswered. As explained in response to part a) of Exhibit I.STAFF-11, Enbridge Gas has received no further correspondence from HDI on the Project and HDI has not raised any specific rights-based concerns. Enbridge Gas will continue to try to engage with HDI regarding the Project as well as to discuss HDI's concerns with Enbridge Gas and its assets in Ontario more generally.

49. In addition to the consultation Enbridge Gas has undertaken with the four Indigenous groups identified by MEM, the OEB process for Enbridge Gas's Application provided the Nations a further opportunity to share their comments and concerns about the Project and gain an understanding of how those concerns would be addressed. Direct notice of the application was provided by Enbridge Gas to all potentially affected Indigenous communities identified by MEM in its Delegation Letter and none of them sought to intervene or otherwise participate directly in the hearing.
50. Subsequent to Enbridge Gas's responses to the interrogatories which included an update of the ICR and related summary⁵⁵, a SNGR representative, in response to an email from Stantec Consulting Ltd. requesting SNGR's review of an ER for an unrelated Enbridge Gas project, reiterated the previously identified concern regarding the need for obtaining baseline data for potential routes and confirmed it is the key issue for both projects. Enbridge Gas had previously responded to this concern to both in writing⁵⁶ and at a meeting between Enbridge Gas and SNGR representatives⁵⁷. Consistent with its commitment to engaging with Nations throughout the lifecycle of its projects, Enbridge Gas will continue to make efforts to address concerns raised by the Nations with respect to its projects and operations.
51. OEB staff submitted that if the OEB determines that it is appropriate to grant leave to construct the Project, the OEB should wait to receive the letter of opinion

⁵⁵ Exhibit I.STAFF-10, Attachments 1 and 2.

⁵⁶ Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 7, Line-item attachments 3.22 and 3.24.

⁵⁷ Exhibit I.STAFF-10, Attachment 2, Line Item 3.29.

from the Ministry before approving the application. If the letter of opinion is not filed by the close of the record, the OEB may consider placing the proceeding in abeyance until such time that letter is filed.⁵⁸ Enbridge Gas is of the view that such an abeyance should not be necessary. While Enbridge Gas has not yet received the letter of opinion from the Ministry confirming sufficiency of Indigenous consultation activities for the Project, recognizing the extent of consultation undertaken, Enbridge Gas's commitment to ongoing engagement, the minimal anticipated impact of the Project (which is located within a municipal road allowance and on existing customer's sites), and the mitigation measures Enbridge Gas has committed to implement, Enbridge Gas is of the view that there is no reason the Ministry should not issue a letter confirming sufficiency in short order.

H. Conditions of Approval

52. OEB staff submitted that the OEB should approve the Project subject to the OEB's standard conditions of approval for natural gas leave to construct applications.⁵⁹
53. Enbridge Gas hereby confirms its intention to satisfy the OEB's standard conditions of approval and will comply with the final conditions of approval established by the OEB.

I. Conclusion

54. Based on the foregoing, Enbridge Gas respectfully requests that the OEB issue an order granting leave to construct the Mississauga Reinforcement Project pursuant to section 90(1) of the OEB Act. If approved, Enbridge Gas is targeting to commence construction for the Project in April 2026 and be placed into service by November 2026. As such, Enbridge Gas respectfully requests that the OEB

⁵⁸ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 11.

⁵⁹ OEB Staff Submission, September 4, 2025, p. 11.

issue its decision expeditiously to enable Enbridge Gas to meet the construct schedule for the Project.