

REF: Ex. B, Tab 1, Sch. 1, Table 1 and Ex. C, Tab 1, Sch. 1, pg. 3

Preamble: In our review of the prefiled evidence, we recognized that there is no information regarding the amount of hourly demand from the customers identified in the forecast attachment schedule for any party to test the sizing of the proposed piping. In the two paragraphs that make up the facilities alternative section, the following assertion was made:

Considering that the Project was previously reviewed and approved by the Government of Ontario and the OEB for the purposes of granting funding under Phase 2 of the NGEF, Enbridge Gas did not assess other facility alternatives.

We would like to understand better and bridge gases reliance on the previous review by the government and the OEB For the appropriateness of the pipe sizing for this project.

- 1) In submitting information to the government and the OEB for the purpose of grant funding, did Enbridge provide hourly flow data to be able to test the appropriateness of the pipe sizing for the project?
 - a) If so, please provide the hourly data that is generated by the attachment forecast.
 - b) Did Enbridge run simulations to determine the proven sizing for the project?
 - i) If not, why not?
 - (1) How did Enbridge establish the pipe sizing as appropriate for the grant application?
 - ii) If so, please provide the results of the simulation that was used to determine the appropriate pipe size for the project?
 - (1) If the simulation results were provided, please file them in response to this interrogatory.
 - (2) If not, how does Enbridge believe that the government or the OEB we're satisfied with the appropriateness of the pipe sizing?
- 2) If neither the hourly demand forecast nor the simulation results were provided with the grant application, please provide:
 - a) The results of the analyses performed to consider and recommend the appropriate facilities sizing for this project.
 - b) Please ensure that the analyses for all alternatives considered are filed in response to this interrogatory. Please ensure that this IR response includes:
 - i) a map showing the links and the junction points used as load centers plus the location of the two industrial customers
 - ii) please ensure these analysis provide the lengths of pipe between load centers

- iii) the hourly demand that was generated for the sizing of the pipe in:
 - (1) 5 years
 - (2) 10 years
- iv) The assumed pressure setting for the station feeding the new pipeline and the low point at the end of the system
 - (1) Please ensure that the maximum and minimum operating pressures of this system are provided also
- v) the additional hourly demand capacity that remains in the project after:
 - (1) year 5
 - (2) year 10
- vi) Any sensitivity analyses that were undertaken to understand the possibility of reducing some of the NPS₄ to NPS 2
 - (1) If no sensitivity analyses were undertaken, please run an additional analysis that assumes the industrial hourly demand is half of the value that was used in generating the project results.
 - (a) Please determine the amount of NPS 4 pipe that could hypothetically be reduced to NPS 2 in this scenario.
 - (b) Please provide the company's views on its obligation to review multiple scenarios for the purpose of determining the appropriate pipe size